$125
211
Class Lit 1900K Book B439 C2
General Theological Seminary Library
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK
PRESENTED BY
.....
2971

Lucas. —

Ξ ν'

ν / ς

THE
Principles
OF THE
BOOK
OF
COMMON PRAYER.

This Book is from the
Library of the late
Rev Dr Cahill

LONDON:
RICHARDS, 100, ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

THE

Principles

OF THE

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

CONSIDERED.

A SERIES OF LECTURE SERMONS.

BY THE

REV. WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M.A.

LATE STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD, AND PERPETUAL CURATE OF S. PAUL'S, KNIGHTSBRIDGE.

"Falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth."—1 Cor. xiv. 25.

NEW EDITION.

LONDON:

W. J. CLEAVER, BAKER STREET,

PORTMAN SQUARE.

MDCCCXLVIII.

109230
Lit 1900k
B439
c2

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

PREFACE.

THE many controversies which have arisen of late on the subject of the Prayer Book, may be referred partly, indeed, to the prejudices of the laity; but, perhaps, more so to mistakes in the teaching of the clergy. We have generally found that any restoration of those forms and ceremonies of our Church which were usual at the time of the Reformation, have been met by the people with distrust and with resistance; but, at the same time, we must in candour allow that in many cases this distrust and resistance have been the consequences of a want of proper information, rather than acts of wilful disobedience to the Church's laws. The clergy should reflect that they anticipate the natural order of things when they strive to gather the fruit before they have sown the seed. It is a true Catholic principle in its very best sense to love such usages and customs as bear the mark of antiquity. To give to anything the name of "innovation," is to give to it the name most odious in the eyes of a Catholic and an Englishman. But they whose occupations in life are (as must be the case in the great majority of the people) so all-absorbing as to deprive them of the opportunity of searching and reading for themselves, will of course measure antiquity by their own memories. For them

antiquity reaches no further than a single generation, therefore the resistance of such ought to form no substantial ground of regret; for the Church has only patiently and by discreet teaching to remove these narrow limits of the notion of antiquity, and she she will cast back the imputation of "novelty" on the very points now cherished and beloved as ancient. Then these very same persons on their own grounds will become the Church's staunchest followers and most faithful sons.

Much it may be feared has been lost; many hearts have been unwon; many minds still unconvinced of the wisdom of our Church's laws, merely because of the unwise forcing on the part of the clergy of what is really right, on ground unprepared to receive it. The PRINCIPLES of the Prayer Book should be put before the people, by long and judicious teaching, before one single point of observance, as a matter of detail, should be hazarded. It is to begin at the wrong end, to force observances upon the ignorant, and then defend them as a right *afterwards*. If there is to be a battle, it had better be one in which the ammunition and stores are prepared beforehand; not sought for in the emergency of the actual conflict. Thus, with respect to the Book of Common Prayer, how many, rushing forward to restore its ancient usages with hasty confidence, in opposition to their parishioners, have been forced to beat an ignominious retreat, and, giving their reasons for what they have done, *after* they have done it, have conceded the victory to dissenters, schismatics, and newspapers. The PRINCIPLES of things, the first rudiments, matters of history, as such, require to be fully developed and explained to the people. The details will then quickly follow. Men, being reasonable beings, will, in most instances, fall in with the truth when they have opportunity of knowing it.

But, on the other hand, as the clergy have on their side been, in some instances, guilty of haste in pressing their views upon the people; so we must acknowledge that in many instances also great bitterness of feeling, and want of charity, as well as hastiness in judging, have characterized the conduct of the laity.

Three points ought to be observed by all parishioners in judging of their parish priest, when he adopts a closer conformity with the Prayer Book than may have been customary.

1. They ought to consider the nature of the obligation under which, as a priest of the Church of England, he stands towards that Church. The minister of the Church of England, whether he be Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, has no will of his own as an individual; he has no right or power in any way to deviate from that which the Church commands. If he did not fully, both in conscience and in spirit, intend to obey the Church when he took upon himself the sacred office he bears, he should not be found standing before the people to minister at her altars. The parishioner, then, should compare the priest's performance of the Divine Service with the following solemn and specific pledges which he made both at his ordination, and also at his assumption of the parochial change.

1. At ordination, every Priest thus declares and subscribes:—

"That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, containeth in it nothing contraray to God's word, and that it may lawfully be so used, and that *he himself will so use the form in the said book prescribed in public prayer and the sacraments, and none other.*"

2. When he is appointed to minister in any congregation, he declares before the people as follows:—

"I, A. B., do here declare my unfeigned assent and consent *to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the sacraments and other rites and ceremonies of the Church.*"

3. But, above all, the license by which he is appointed by the Bishop to minister in any church is set forth in these words:—

"———by Divine permission, Bishop of ———, to our beloved in Christ——— greeting. We do by these presents give and grant unto you, in whose fidelity, morals, learning, sound doctrine, and diligence, we do fully confide, our license and authority to perform the office of ————, within our diocese and jurisdiction, in reading the common prayers and performing other ecclesiastical duties belonging to the said office, *according to the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer*, made and published by authority of Parliament, and the canons and constitutions in that behalf, lawfully established and promulged, AND NOT OTHERWISE, or IN ANY OTHER MANNER, you having first before us subscribed the articles, and TAKEN THE OATHS, and made and subscribed the declaration," etc. etc.

II. Having thus ascertained the nature of the obligation under which the priest comes before them, let the parishioners then turn, as the next process of judging of his conduct, to the Prayer Book itself.

But here a preliminary caution must be interposed, lest they go upon wrong data. The question for each of them will be, *Is my copy of the Prayer Book a correct one?* Now there are many spurious Prayer Books set forth by the booksellers,—many compilations, selections, and abridgments, which it is not fair to consider as in any way representing the Church Prayer Book. Even those published at Oxford and Cambridge, are not in every way correct, and there-

fore, particularly in the rubrics,* must not altogether be trusted.

Some of the books which are now used in Church omit the Calendars and Prefaces; some, where there is a double hymn or prayer, omit one; some join the proper lessons of the Sundays to the prayers, omitting all the other lessons, and seeming to intimate, that the possessor of such a book never needs to attend Divine Service on the week-days; some again omit all the occasional offices, never contemplating the presence of the people at a baptism, a confirmation, or a marriage. Some again omit the ordinal, considering the ordination of the ministry as in no degree affecting the laity; while others, even those published with authority, insert verse hymns of various descriptions, which are only the compositions of private individuals, and do not belong in any sense to the Church. It is obvious then, that with all these spurious books abounding, the parishioner who takes up his Prayer Book for the purpose of judging his parish priest, needs first to ascertain its accuracy and genuineness.

* An instance of this was brought under public notice by the Bishop of Exeter, in the House of Lords, Feb. 27, 1845. The rubric for publishing the banns of marriage has been altered without authority, from its place before the offertory, to the second lesson after morning or evening prayer. In all old Prayer Books, we shall find the banns directed to be published with the other citations, excommunications, and notices, after the Nicene Creed. By the act for preventing clandestine marriages, it was ordered that the banns should be published, in churches where there was no *morning* service (consequently no Nicene Creed or offertory), after the second lesson in the *evening* service. The rubric, by some negligence, has thus been changed so as to make it appear that the banns should be published at *all* times after the second lesson, which was obviously not the intention of the act. The rubric cannot be altered, either by the crown or the parliament. Notices such as *banns* may be directed to be published; but the original rubric cannot be altered. It is much to be wished that the Prayer Book should hereafter be printed with this rubric correctly inserted.

III. But once more,—having ascertained that the copy of the Prayer Book which he possesses is correct,—still even then he will require much knowledge of the usages and customs of the Church, both before and at the time when the Prayer Book was first issued; otherwise he cannot form a fair judgment. The Prayer Book now in use, be it remembered, is not the first Prayer Book of the Reformation. He must therefore go back to that which *is* the first,—that of Edward VI, set forth in the year 1549. Having got that book, he must even then have a knowledge of what the traditional customs of the Church were in the various dioceses of England at the time of its compilation. He must bear this rule strongly in mind,—that whatever was in use in the Church before the Reformation, *and is not forbidden in our present Book*, remains a custom to us, authorized, sanctioned, and continued. Such, for instance, is the turning to the East in prayer, especially in saying the Creed. This was a custom of the Church before the Reformation; *and not being forbidden*, remains a custom still.

When a person, beholding in his family or in his estate a great number of abuses and wrongs, sets to work with vigour and publicity, inviting the attention of all upon him, to redress those wrongs, and to abolish those abuses,—when, I say, so doing, he omits to notice certain things which obviously exist, all the things so unnoticed must be taken to be, in his estimation, not abuses, but right and true things. So in the Church, all that is *not* purposely put aside, purposely remains. And this applies to a thousand minute points of ritual in the Prayer Book, which he who is to form a judgment of his priest must make himself master of.

While, then, the duty is incumbent upon the priest not to force upon his flock any practices to which

they are unused, without first imparting the knowledge requisite for their intelligent and hearty reception; it is on the other hand a duty equally incumbent upon the people, to refrain from pronouncing any judgment upon the proceedings of their priest, until they have taken measures to acquire the data necessary for judging soberly and rightly.

It is hoped that the present work, may, in a very humble way, furnish some of these data. To the congregation before whom the greater part of what is written in these pages was originally delivered, in the course of parochial teaching, I owe in every way the expression of my thanks, not only for their abstinence from any of the popular outcries which have disturbed other parishes, but also for the cordial, faithful, and church-like cooperation which they have afforded me at all times in carrying into effect the *principles of the Book of Common Prayer* herein advocated. As time rolls on, and the mind and character of the people, specially of the rising generation, gradually unfold and open out into the full beauty of the Catholic feeling fostered by our Church;—as prejudice dies away, and habit ceases to be an argument against the faithful observance of our Prayer Book's requirements and teaching;—as the writings as well as the examples of our great and good bishops, and other divines of the seventeenth century, are better read and more known; and as men learn by experience how much wiser it is to trust to the calm testimony of ages, than to the tumultuous excitements of momentary passion,—so, I doubt not, as long as we proceed with humility towards God, and charity towards one another, we shall by degrees regain our lost influence over our countrymen, and win back to the fold, by the faithful temper of our doctrines, the Dissenter on the one hand, and the Romanist on the other. While great perils evidently await our Church,

from the laxity of the State, and the latitudinarianism of our parliament, still, whenever it shall please God that the Church by suffering shall learn no longer to trust to the broken reeds of Egypt, but to rely solely on her own principles and her own faith, then she will come forth again as a giant refreshed with wine, and the hearts of all men shall turn towards her; and she will lift up her banner on high, and be once more that which she was in the olden times of her purity and her strength—the faithful guide and ruler of her people.

CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

ON PUBLIC PRAYER, AS DERIVED FROM REASON.

1 *Cor.* xiv, 15.

"I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also." - - - - 1

SERMON II.

ON PUBLIC PRAYER, AS DERIVED FROM SCRIPTURE.

Matt. vi, 9.

"After this manner therefore pray ye." - - 13

SERMON III.

HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Psalm lxxviii, 6, 7.

"That their posterity might know it, and the children which were yet unborn; to the intent that when they came up they might teach their children the same." - - 28

SERMON IV.

THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

Deuteronomy iv, 2.

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it." - - 51

SERMON V.

THE DAILY SERVICE.

Acts iii, 1.

"Now Peter and John went up together into the Temple, at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour." - - 77

SERMON VI.

THE CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCH.

Psalm cxix, 8.

"I will keep thy ceremonies" - - - - 98

SERMON VII.

THE FEASTS OF THE CHURCH.

Leviticus xxiii, 4.

"These are the feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations which ye shall proclaim in their seasons." - - 125

SERMON VIII.

THE FASTS OF THE CHURCH.

Joel i, 14.

"Sanctify ye a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders, and all the inhabitants of the land, into the house of the Lord your God." - - - 146

SERMON IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY PLACES.

2 *Chronicles* vi, 2.

" I have built an house of habitation for Thee, and a place for Thy dwelling for ever." - - - - 174

SERMON X.

THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

Hebrews v, 4.

" No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." - - - 200

SERMON XI.

ORNAMENTS OF DIVINE SERVICE.

Ezra vii, 27.

" To beautify the house of the Lord." - - - 229

SERMON XII.

PASTORAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH.

Acts xx, 28.

" Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed the Church of God." - - - 255

SERMON XIII.

THE CHORAL SERVICE.

2 *Chronicles* v, 13.

"They lifted up their voice with the trumpets and cymbals, and instruments of music, and praised the Lord." 283

SERMON XIV.

ANALOGY OF THE PRAYER BOOK WITH HUMAN LIFE.

1 *Thessalonians* v. 17, 18.

"Pray without ceasing. In everything give thanks." - 310

SERMON

I.

ON PUBLIC PRAYER, AS DERIVED FROM REASON.

1 Cor. xiv, 15.

"*I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.*"

The great duty of prayer to Almighty God is acknowledged by all. However imperfectly it may be practised, however inconsistently, however irregularly, still in theory the doctrine and efficacy of prayer is recognized by every one who pretends to a belief in divine Providence.

And if we proceed a step further, from personal and individual prayer to joint or public prayer,—though in this the consent of man may not be so universal, still it is very general. There may be some few, who, though compelled to acknowledge the duty, as of obligation, to shut to the door and pray to God in secret, may yet be blind to the promises of a Saviour, that "when two or three are met together there is God in the midst of them"; there may be some few; but looking generally upon the Christian world, we may safely say that public worship, consisting of prayer and praise offered up to God as from a congregation, is a recognized Christian duty.

But this general agreement is very much narrowed, if not destroyed, when we come to consider the *way* and *method* by which this duty may be carried into effect. For

instance, if we go into a Church, we shall find the standard of devotion to be the Book of Common Prayer, and therein we shall find certain words and ceremonies commanded, and holy vestments used, and all things done as to *days*, *times*, and *men*, of one prescript and regular order; while in a conventicle which may unhappily be set up against that Church, we should find the praying out of books looked upon as contrary to Christianity, and the essence and beauty of public prayer thought to consist in extemporaneous novelty—no form prescribed, no words restricted.

Here, then, is the *principle* of public prayer acknowledged, while in the method of its practice there is disagreement. But it may be said, Is not this disagreement consistent with Christian liberty? It may be. Shall he who prays extemporaneously in the conventicle, or he who prays by a liturgy in the Church, be either of them condemned of the other? May not God hear the prayer of both? Undoubtedly, He may. Charity will make many allowances. "Charity hopeth all things." But the question is, which is the method most in unison with *reason*, with the *Scriptures*, with the custom of the *universal Church*,— which most efficaciously, which most surely brings out the true *meaning* of prayer,—which makes it an offering and spiritual sacrifice the more worthy, in the name of Jesus Christ, to lay before the altar of our God?

I propose to consider this question in the following Sermon, by way of introduction to a series of Lectures on the Book of Common Prayer. And first I must speak on the *principle* of a liturgical form of prayer. As Christians do differ on this principle, we must endeavour to see why it is that they differ, and how it is. We must be quite certain in our own minds that the Church to which we belong is right, in prescribing, as she does, an order and form of common prayer, to which she binds every one within her communion rigidly to adhere.

Let us look to our text. It is taken from the Apostle S. Paul: "*I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.*" The two essentials for prayer here mentioned, are the SPIRIT and the UNDERSTANDING.

First in order is the *understanding*. There must be an

intelligent embracing, within the mind, of the *object* of prayer, and the *subject* of prayer. A man must know what his prayer *means*. He must know to *whom* he prays; he must know for *what* he prays; otherwise he does not pray at all. And second in order must be the *spirit*. There must be a desire to have what is asked for. It must come within the compass of our wishes. We must long for it, hope for it, and believe that the granting or withholding it is within the power of Him to whom we pray. Without the first of these, namely, the *understanding*, we might as well be infants or idiots; without the second, namely, the *spirit*, we might as well be infidels. A failure in either of these two requisites destroys all prayer, both public and private. All that may be uttered by the lips is, without these, a mere mockery, nay, it is a blasphemy against God.

These two essential points being, then, conceded according to the Apostle, we shall have to apply them in our present purpose to a *congregation*. An individual praying in secret needs no words in which to clothe his prayer. He may, as Moses, speak nothing; or as Hannah, speak only in the heart; or, as our blessed Lord, with strong cries supplicate God, and yet utter no word; praying with the *mind* only: but in public prayer this cannot be. There must be an external body, in which the spirit of prayer is clothed. This external body is *language*. Some one must speak aloud. Words must be used, by which the things desired may be conveyed to all who are joining in the prayer. But these words—this body in which prayer is clothed; this *vehicle* or means by which prayer is conveyed from one man to a large number, as in public worship, must embrace the two points before agreed upon. It must affect the *understanding* of the congregation, and it must affect the *spirit* of the congregation. If *not*, it ceases to be prayer altogether. The question, then, resolves itself into this;—Does a Liturgy effect this, or does an extemporaneous effusion effect this? or which does it best?

Now, let us take the objections which separatists and non-conformists have made to our Liturgy, and consider

how they bear on these principles; we shall then, perhaps, arrive at the truth. The objections which non-conformists bring against our Book of Common Prayer are three-fold. First, they say that it is *a mere form**;

* The point upon which the objectors to a Liturgy seem to turn with most frequent recurrence is this,—that prayer is a *gift of the Spirit*; and they confine this gift of the Spirit to an extemporaneous effusion. In the preface to the Directory, in the reign of Charles I, it is stated, as one of the reasons for abolishing the Book of Common Prayer,—

"That the Liturgy has given great encouragement to an idle and unedifying ministry, who choose rather to acquiesce in forms made to their hands, than to exert themselves in exercising *the gift of prayer*, a gift with which our Saviour Christ furnishes all those called by Him to that office."

In the Savoy Conference, we find the same point urged again:

"That the *gift of prayer* being one special qualification for the ministry, they desire that the Liturgy may not be so strictly imposed as totally to exclude the exercise of that faculty," &c.

And Hooker mentions, as the point of objection:

"It shall not be necessary," say they, "for the minister daily to repeat all these things before-mentioned, but, beginning with some confession, to proceed to the sermon, which ended, he either useth the prayer for all states before-mentioned, or else prayeth *as the Spirit of God shall move his heart.*"

Bishop Taylor also mentions it:

"But it is pretended that there is such a thing as the *gift of prayer*, —*a praying with the Spirit*.....And to this purpose are pretended those places of Scripture which speak of the assistance of God's Spirit in our prayers. 'And I will pour upon the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem the spirit of grace'; but especially *Rom.* viii. 26 From whence the conclusion that is inferred is, in the words of S. Paul, 'that we must pray with the spirit.' Therefore, not with set forms,—therefore, extempore."

Which reasoning, after other observations, he demolishes thus:

"And now let us take a man that pretends he hath the *gift of prayer* ...and loves to pray extempore. I suppose his thoughts go a little before his tongue. I demand then, whether cannot this man, when it is once come into his head, hold his tongue, and *write down* what he hath conceived? If his first conceptions were of God and God's Spirit, then they are so still, even when they are written. Or is the Spirit departed from him at the sight of a pen and ink-horn? It did use to be otherwise among the old and new prophets, whether they were prophets of prediction or ordinary ministry. But if his conception may be written, and, being written, is still a production of the Spirit, then it follows that 'set forms of prayer,' deliberate and described, may as well be a praying with the Spirit, as sudden forms and extempore outlets."—*Bishop Jeremy Taylor*, Works, vii, p. 335, Heber's edition.

Secondly, they say that it is a form *imposed upon them;* and, Thirdly, they say that to pray by a Liturgy *cramps and confines* the *subjects of prayer.*

1. First, then, it is a *form,* But is not extemporaneous prayer a form also? There are different sorts of forms. One may be printed, another may be written, and another may be committed to memory and repeated. And even though a prayer may be really conceived, composed, and delivered at the very moment, still, though it may not be a form to the person who uses it, it must be so to the congregation who hear it. Even Baxter, who was chief of the nonconformist party of his time, and to this day is held in the first estimation among dissenters,—even he allows this, and writes thus: "Whoever speaketh extempore, his words are a form when he speaketh them."* No one will presume that in the present age we are to expect a miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit, such as was formerly vouchsafed to the Apostles. Such miraculous and special power of prayer being excepted, no man can possibly utter a prayer, strictly speaking, extemporaneously. He must have premeditated; he must have planned beforehand what he is going to say; he must have arranged the method and the matter, if not the words. It is of no consequence whether that premeditation has taken place years before, or one moment before; still it is a premeditated prayer. He knows what his thoughts are; he sees beforehand the subject-matter of which he is going to speak, and he clothes that matter in a certain form of words. Every thing clothed in words is *a form:* the only difference is, that a Liturgy is a form known to the congregation—an extemporaneous prayer, a form unknown to the congregation. But here, perhaps, it may be said, Why that is the very point. Its being *unknown* constitutes its beauty; its being *unknown* awakens the attention, and stimulates the devotion: suffers not the mind to flag and become careless. But consider—The two essentials ne-

* Baxter, *Christian Directory,* Question LXXII. "Are public forms of man's devising or composing lawful?" He adds: "Though not a *premeditated* form." But this is clearly disproved in the text above; for a man *must* premeditate if he speaks.

cessary to constitute prayer have been agreed upon to be the *spirit* and the *understanding*—and those simultaneous. The spirit certainly; but the understanding *also*. Suppose that an extemporaneous prayer be offered up, can your spirit and your understanding go along with the words, which you hear for the first time, so quickly, as to make it a prayer to yourself? A joint prayer is an outpouring of the feelings by words, in requesting of God some general benefit, and such that every individual in the congregation may join in it. Remember what prayer is: it is making a request of God. Now, in an extemporaneous prayer—grant everything which it has a right to claim—its fervency, its unlimited room to expatiate on the mercies and goodness of God, the stimulus it gives to the person offering it, and thereby the stimulus conveyed by sympathy to the assembled people—yet, still, it is the prayer but of *one man after all*. It is the prayer only of the man who offers it, and not of any one of the congregation. The one man prays: the congregation look at him and listen to him as he prays, but they *do not pray themselves*.

A beggar full of want, wretchedness, and misery, approaches a benevolent man. The beggar pours forth, out of his own feeling of woe, a piteous tale of sorrow. He confesses his misery; he begs for relief; he prays for help. A third person is standing by. This third person is moved by the earnestness of voice, and the eloquence of words which the supplicating beggar pours forth. He hopes that the poor man may be relieved; he sympathizes with him; he is anxious for him; but he does not pray to the benevolent man *himself*. Now this is just the sort of excitement that a congregation, or any individual, hearing an extemporaneous prayer of another man, must feel. They may *look on*, they may *admire*, they may *listen*, they may be *moved*. just as they would be by a pathetic tale; but they do not fulfil the office of praying. It is impossible, if you come closely to analyze it; for, first, the mind has to fulfil its intellectual process, and is listening for words to form a grammatical and intelligible sentence; but while it is so doing, it loses the opportunity of making that sen-

tence into a wish, because it is hurried on to another; and then to another, and then to another, and so while the *understanding* is striving to do its work, the *spirit* is entirely lost; or, on the other hand, if the *spirit* only is moved—moved in admiration or in sympathy—if we are considering another man, *his* eloquence, *his* flow of words, *his* enunciation of doctrine; if we are occupied in the excitement and agitation produced by what *he* is saying; then the mental application to *self*, the *understanding* is lost, and in either case prayer there is none.

But let there be a *Liturgy*—a *known* form of prayer—a standard and order by which every word is known beforehand, then there is only one operation of the mind to be called into play. The *understanding* is satisfied long before; we see before us what is printed; we know from habit what the sentences to be spoken are; and the mind, thus relieved from one duty, of listening for that which is to come, or remembering that which has just passed, has nothing to do but to join with the *spirit* in the supplication which the minister is pouring forth.

II. But, again, another objection is brought against a Liturgy; that it is *imposed* upon the congregation; that they are tied to that particular method, and no opportunity ever allowed of praying in another; that doctrines and opinions are thus forced upon them whether they will or no.* But is not extemporaneous prayer just as much a form imposed? Are not the peculiar doctrines and peculiar opinions of the person who uses that prayer just as much forced upon the congregation for the time being? If every person in the congregation prays his own prayer

* Here again, Baxter, though non-conforming, still maintains the principle of the lawfulness of *imposing forms*. He says: "Is it lawful to impose forms on the congregation or the people in public worship? Yes, and *more than lawful*. It is the pastor's duty so to do. [He had better have said the *Church's* duty.] For whether he forethink what to pray or not, his prayer is to them a form of words, and they are bound in all the lawful parts to concur with him in spirit or desire, and to say Amen. So that every minister by *office* is daily to impose a form of prayer on all the people in the congregation; only some men impose the same form many times over, and others impose every day a new one."—*Baxter*, Christian Directory, Question lxxiv.

extemporaneously, furnishes his own topics of request, and dwells upon his own peculiar doctrines, then it is no longer a *joint* prayer, a *public* or *common* prayer; but if one speaks for the rest, and suggests his own supplication, are not the rest forced to join in listening to that supplication? If one man, as the mouth-piece of others, addresses Almighty God, and beseeches of Him, on certain conditions, a gift or blessing,—is not every one who listens, on the supposition of jointly asking that gift or blessing, brought of necessity, whether he likes it or no, under those conditions? There is, most surely, something imposed or forced, just as much in the one case as in the other. Since, then, there must be *some* form imposed, which, we may confidently ask, would be the more preferable—that the form should be imposed upon us by a *Church;* that the prayer should be prepared for us by the well organized and systematic regulation of many wise and good men, with the word of God before them for a guide, with the customs of antiquity for precedents, with due consideration, long discussion, every thought balanced, every word weighed;—or that we should trust to the momentary effusions of an individual, who, however good, however able, however gifted he might be, could not at all times be said to be equal, and might from a thousand accidents fail, either from bad memory, or from want of readiness of expression, or inability at the very moment they might be wanted, of seizing and applying, in his requests of God, those topics which the sinfulness of man and the redemption of the world by the Son of God, would claim at his hands?

And remember this too, that, in the Liturgical form of prayer, you come with your book before you; you know before hand what it is you are going to say; you are made aware of what is to be asked, and its conditions; you know the doctrines and the opinions which it conveys; and, if you do not conscientiously agree with them, you need not come. Whereas, if you go to listen to an extemporaneous prayer, you cannot possibly tell what it is you shall hear, or be asked to give assent to: you are at the mercy of the time being, and the single individual before you; you know not what rude fancies, what ill-digested expressions, what misapplica-

tions of Scripture, you may possibly be compelled, however against your will, and however much to your surprise, to listen to. There cannot be in the man who officiates a compliance with every shade of opinion which may exist in every person of his congregatinn ; and if not, to that person his prayer is a *form imposed*. How fanciful, fickle, changeable, are men! No end would there be to the confusion, if every one had his prayer, every one his psalm, every one his doctrine. We cannot *all* be pleased ; we cannot *all*, at every season of our fortunes, and in every turn of our mind, expect to find exactly what will suit us. We must give up our own ways. It may, indeed, be imagined to be grating and harsh to our feelings, to submit to an *individual* in the sort of prayer which he may think fit to impose upon us ; but, when the *Church* directs it—whose office it is so to do ; the *Church*, "which is the pillar and ground of the truth", against which the gates of hell are not, by Christ's promise, to prevail ; which we are told "*to hear*"; which is the chosen instrument by which God preaches His Gospel to fallen men ; what degradation or offence to our pride can there be, that we should be asked to submit our judgment and our ways to *hers ?*

III. The third objection to a Liturgy was this : That it cramps and confines our devotion to certain specified limits ; that it does not give us freedom in the subjects and application of prayer.

I hope it will be remembered that we are not now speaking of individual prayer ; that when we "shut to our door, and pray to our heavenly Father, which seeth in secret," laying bare our hearts, confessing the weakness, and the sinfulness of our lives, and requesting of the Almighty the mercy which He has promised by the atoning blood of his only Son ; in this case it is not necessary that we use any form at all. In this case we might, and no doubt should, fall prostrate on our knees before the great Almighty, and pour forth our wants with copious flowing thoughts ; our words would need no explanation, would require no commentator to set forth their meaning ; for they would only be between ourselves and God, and God would understand our heart, and hear the voice of

our mind, even though, as I observed before in the case of Hannah, it spoke no words at all.

But we are not speaking of private or individual prayer. We are speaking of the public prayer of a congregation, met together to make a *joint*, *common*, *public* request to the Almighty; and these are two perfectly distinct duties.* In the latter, it is quite impossible that we should enter into every man's private circumstances, either for the confession of sins, or the deprecation of evil; for the expression of our wants, or rendering unto God thanksgiving; but we must draw up such a form of prayer as shall be comprehensive, general, and universally applicable; we must ask for such things as man requires in company with his brethren; we must confess such sins as there shall not be one in the congregation who has not need to confess; we must implore such benefits as shall be needed for us as a country, as a Church, as a people; we must praise God for such blessings as He has shed upon us *all*,—not one more than another, but *all*, as being joint heirs with Christ of the glorious kingdom of Almighty God. There must then, by the nature of the thing, be a limit to this. Our devotion *must*, in order that it may be joint devotion, dwell upon those topics which all can join in. We cannot particularize; we cannot ascend into such extraordinary and enthusiastic flights of expression as possibly one man, from natural warmth of temperament, might conscientiously feel; but to which another, from a deficiency of that warmth of temperament, might be puzzled to attach any meaning. No: it is perfectly clear that joint or public prayer must be within a certain range and limit; that it must be calm, that it must be dignified, that it must be on such subjects as are generally applicable to a mixed con-

* And yet this is one of the main grievances at the Savoy Conference. The Presbyterian party complained "of a great defect in the forms of public thanksgiving." They complained: "That the whole body of the Common Prayer is too much wrapped up in generals, as 'to be kept from evil,' 'from all enemies,' 'from all adversity,' 'that we may do God's will,' &c. without dilating upon the particulars included."—See *Collier's History*, last edition, vol. viii, p. 425.

gregation ; that it must deal in such topics, be clothed in such words, and be founded upon such doctrines, as are intelligible to the understanding, and come home to the feelings of the lowest, simplest, poorest, and most ignorant, How can this be done in an extemporaneous prayer? Can it be done in *any* prayer, but one which from habit is well known, and in which, from the language being constantly before us, no great stretch of the understanding is required at the time of praying, to make the request intelligible? It would appear not. To attempt otherwise, would be a mockery of Almighty God. It would be just one man made as a sort of representative or deputy of a whole congregation, while they whom he represented, or whose deputy he was, might be looking on, not knowing what he was about. It would be just precisely what S. Paul says in the chapter from which the text at the head of this sermon is taken, praying in an *unknown* tongue: "For if I pray in an *unknown* tongue, my spirit prayeth; but my understanding is unfruitful. What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also. Else, when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned, say Amen at thy giving of thanks? seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest."—1 Cor. xiv, 14-16.

The result of all this must surely be, in every candid mind, a conviction that a Liturgical form of prayer does, in reality, fulfil the meaning of the Apostolic precept, and that no other way of publicly praying can do so. We, my brethren, as God's ministers in this holy place, should not come daily, morning, and evening, before our heavenly Father, and publicly pray to Him from the Church's Book of Common Prayer, unless we were very deeply embued with the conviction that a Liturgical form of prayer is the best which a Christian can use. "Cursed is he that, having a better lamb in his flock, offers up a worse." Nor would you, my brethren, enter this House of Prayer as often as you do—whether it be on the Lord's day *only*, or whether it be, more happily, *every* day—unless you also, on the whole, were persuaded in your hearts that this Liturgy,

this offering which you habitually make of your prayers and your praise, in set order and form, were right, and sound, and beneficial to your eternal interests. But still, you must be aware that this method of the Church in public prayer,—this holy book, out of which we pray, and the forms of which we use,—is not on all sides approved with that cordiality which it deserves, even among ourselves. It is called by many *formal* and *tedious*, and by some enthusiastic minds it is complied with reluctantly; and many are led away by extravagant notions, to say that an extemporaneous way of praying has more fervour and devotion in it, and brings out more warmly the heart and the feelings; and they speak as though in regret at the *coldness* (as they would say) of our regular and oft-repeated prayers, —the very same words ever recurring, without change and without novelty. It may be feared that this is the case with many, not absolute Dissenters, but men not fully enjoying the beauties and privileges of our Liturgy; sometimes lingering on the borders of separation, doubtful, discontented, tempted to depart. At any rate, I feel sure that a vast portion of our congregations, even of those of a higher and more educated rank little appreciate the beauties of our Liturgy: they use it by habit, say the words by custom, follow the order of the prayers, and Creeds, and Psalms, without perceiving the peculiarities which are attached to them, and do not heed the great and deep doctrines of Divine truth embodied in them.

And from all this springs that coldness in our congregations, of which we are by men of devout spirits accused, and that air of irreverence, negligence, and disorder, in our general Church worship, which warm-hearted men not enduring, either fly into the extravagant enthusiasm of the schismatic, or the more fervid and glowing services of the Romanist.

SERMON
II.

ON PUBLIC PRAYER, AS DERIVED FROM SCRIPTURE.

MATT. vi, 9.

"*After this manner therefore pray ye.*"

WHEN we consider what God is,—His pure spiritual nature—His inapproachable holiness, goodness, and power,—the very notion of our attempting in any way to hold communication with Him, seems at first sight the extremity of presumption. On what ground can such as we speak unto such as God? And if it seems presumption to do this each for ourselves; if the very holiest among us must shrink back in the imagination of speaking unto God,—the very holiest, in the very holiest of times, in our secret chamber, with the world and sin far away,—what must it be when we draw together, in promiscuous crowds, all sorts of minds and characters, the light, the frivolous, the sensual,—what must it be when masses of people, many unthinking, unprepared, many sceptical, many in actual sin, presume to take their places in the presence of God, with the professed object of speaking unto Him?

If God were *visibly* in His houses of prayer, as once He was to the children of Israel, how few of us would venture to go thither. But in the eyes of faith, as we profess to believe, He is there as certainly as though He were seen with the eyes of flesh: "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them;" yet very few think this really, though they say they think it.

But it is our God Himself that has promised to hear prayer; it is *He* that has instituted public worship. It

is not we that presume to come unto God unbidden; but it is He that solicits, entreats, commands us to come; and therefore, happily for us, this natural fear and reluctance which we ought to have as creatures of sin, in approaching God, is taken away. In reconciliation by *grace* we may come near; when in wrath we should by nature fly. Still, however, we must come *cautiously*, *discreetly*, *devoutly*. When great congregations come together to pray, they should not forget that they *do* come together to pray; and if so, they ought well to know what prayer is. Public prayer is not that one man should listen to *another* praying; it is not to sit down and *admire* what another man says;* it is not even to sit still and meditate upon what another man says; but it is that each man, in his own spirit, and each man in his own understanding, pour forth streams of supplication to *God*, and that in such a way that all *externally* join as well as *internally*. It is, so to implore, so to entreat, so to praise, so to glorify, as though God were (as in reality He is) standing in the midst of us.

The question which we considered in the first Sermon involved this point: it was to ascertain which was likely to be the more effectual way of public prayer—the extemporaneous or the Liturgical form. I endeavoured to explain, from the grounds of reason and from the nature of the thing, that a Liturgical form (such as our Book of Common Prayer) could alone produce the effects required in a public congregation; and I reserved, if you will remember, the completion of that question, as resting on the grounds of Holy Scripture and the universal Church.

If Holy Scripture decidedly pronounced one way or the other; if we could find any passage in which an explicit

* It is remarkable how this abuse of the notion of joint prayer breaks out, whenever a Liturgical form is forsaken. Macknight,—a Presbyterian, and one of the most learned of modern commentators on the Epistles,—is thus spoken of by his biographer, in regard to his power of offering extempore prayer: "It may be added that this inexhaustible variety of thought and expression in prayer bespoke a mind richly stored with religious ideas, and at once *surprised and delighted* those who regularly attended his ministry." Instead of the worship of God being the chief effect of prayer, it is here said to be "*surprise and delight*" at the words of man.

direction were given either for the use of a Liturgy, or for its avoidance, then, it is plain, there would never have been that difference of opinion among Christians which now unhappily exists. All men would have considered themselves implicitly bound by the written command of God. But it is not so. God does not expressly command to Christians anything in regard to the forms of prayer to be used in Divine worship. But it does not follow that because nothing is *directly* said, that therefore nothing is said from which we may gather or infer by implication what God's will is. In many things of the very greatest importance, Scripture is silent as far as direct words go, but is very plain when searched into for its spirit. For instance, the appointment of the Lord's day, instead of the Jewish Sabbath, as the great weekly festival; the appointment and government of the Church by bishops; the institution of infant baptism; these and many other points rest for authority, not upon any literal Scripture command, but upon its sense and meaning, interpreted by the Church and illustrated by Apostolic usage at the times nearest and closest to that of the inspired writings. In the same way, then, let us take up the question of a Liturgical form of prayer. First, considering what may be gathered from *the custom of the Jews;* secondly, what may be gathered from *the words and teaching of our blessed Lord and His Apostles;* and thirdly, what may be gathered from the *actual practice of all ancient Churches.*

1. That the Jewish people, under the especial and personal teaching of God, used set forms of prayer, must be allowed by all. The forms which they used are extant to this day, and in the Jewish synagogues of this very city we may at any time go and hear them for ourselves. The Jewish synagogue of the present day is a living witness to God's will, in respect to common forms of prayer. The Jews had two principal services: the service of the Temple, and the service of the synagogue. There were peculiar forms for each; psalms appointed for each day, blessings, prayers, thanksgivings, all set forth in their course. In the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, Moses composed, under the Holy Spirit of God, a song of thanks-

giving, to record his delivery from Egypt. This song was used as a religious service. The whole Jewish people joined in it as a thanksgiving to God. "Then sang Moses and the children of Israel this song unto the Lord." There is also a form of blessing given expressly from God to Moses in the sixth chapter of Numbers: "Speak unto Aaron and his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee and keep thee." In the twenty-first chapter of Deuteronomy, we find a form of prayer appointed by God Himself in the expiation of an uncertain murder. The elders of the city are commanded to join in this prayer, as a public and common religious service. In the twenty-sixth chapter of Deuteronomy, we have again two forms of prayer appointed by God, to be used by the people in offering the first fruits, and in offering the tithes. These prayers are given at length, and they are commanded to be repeated as a religious service word for word. We may add to this, the whole of the psalms of David, composed by him expressly as forms of the Temple worship, and continued by Solomon. And afterwards, in the reformation of religion by Hezekiah, when all things appertaining to religion were carefully remodelled and re-established under the Spirit of God, then the priests and Levites were commanded, as we read in 2 Chron. xxix, 30, to use not their own new words, but the words of David and Asaph.

All these things, when put together, corroborate our position that a set form of prayer is acceptable in God's sight: and when we know that in times farther advanced, when our Lord came upon earth in human flesh, and became expressly our example, He made it His continual practice to join in the Jewish form of service, He took part in those services Himself, and stood up in His turn to read in those services: when we remember, also, that in the many severe denunciations which He made against the Pharisees, He never alluded to their using a form of prayer as objectionable, but only to their *abuse* of it—(He did, indeed, denounce them for vain *repetitions*, for *ostentation*, for *praying in the corners of streets*, but never

for their using a form.*)—I repeat, putting all these considerations together, we have clear testimony to the propriety, as a principle drawn from the Old Testament, of an appointed and prescribed order for Divine Service.

Let us now pass on more immediately to the New Testament. On one occasion, in the eleventh chapter of S. Luke's gospel, our Lord had been praying, as His custom was, and His disciples approach Him, and one of them, in the name of rest, says : "Lord, teach us to pray." The *Jews* had a public way of praying, as just observed ; and *S. John Baptist* had taught his disciples a public way of praying. The Apostles desire accordingly that they, as Christians, as followers of Jesus, should have a public or common way of praying, by which they might be distinguished as others were ; and so they say, "Lord, teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples." And Jesus immediately responds to this, "When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven."

Here then is a distinct form, given by our Lord Himself,—a distinct common form ; and lest it should be said that the giving of this form as the Lord's Prayer, was only a sanction as far as it went,—that it did not sanction any other humanly composed form,—it happens most fortunately that in the gospel of S. Matthew the words are,—

* "Since our Saviour spared not freely to tell the Jews of all the corruptions which they had in his time run into, and on all occasions reproached them therewith, had it been contrary to the will of God to use set forms of prayer in His public service, or had it been displeasing to Him to be addressed in such mean forms, when much better might have been made, we may be sure he would have told them of both, and joined with them in neither; but he having never found fault with them for using set forms, but, on the contrary, taught his own disciples a set form to pray by,—nor at any time expressed a dislike of the forms then in use, because of the meanness and emptiness of them, but always joined with them in their synagogues in the forms above recited,—this may satisfy our Dissenters, if anything can satisfy men so perversely bent after their own ways, that neither our using set forms of prayers in our public worship, nor the using of such which they think not sufficiently edifying, can be objections sufficient to justify them in their refusal to join with us in them. For they have the example of Christ in both these thus directly against them."—*Dean Prideaux*, Connection, part I. book vi.

not "*when ye pray, say,*" which might possibly limit itself to that one form of prayer,—but, "*after this manner pray ye,*" which directly sanctions, authorizes, nay, I think I may say, more than sanctions and authorizes, it advises and commands us that in all our public prayers we should pray after that manner, and that manner was a composed form. Our Lord might have said, if he had approved extemporaneous prayer, "When ye pray, think of such and such general subjects; meditate on such and such blessings which you have received from God; dwell upon the sinfulness of your nature, and the holiness and reverence of God; dwell upon the creation, resurrection, and redemption of man. Let your mind be full of such and such important subjects, and you need not mind the words. The words will come at the time you are praying." Now our Lord *did* use language similar to this on one remarkable occasion. He said to his Apostles, "Ye shall be brought before governors and kings for my sake, for a testimony against them and the Gentiles. But when they deliver you up, *take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak.*" In answer to the question about *Prayer*, supposing that the *form* or the *words* were immaterial, He might also have said, "Take no heed; it shall be *given* you what ye shall speak."

But His answer to that question was very far different. He does not give the mere subjects or heads of prayer. He does not say, "Trust to the time being." He does not say, "Never heed the words, but mind only the spirit." Quite the reverse: "*After this manner, therefore, pray ye.*" And He gives them the manner. He composes the prayer. He ties them down to the very words which He, in His all-gracious mercy, composed as the Christian's form of supplication.

We now come to the Apostles, and primitive Churches. How did *they* act in this matter? Immediately that the Apostles returned to Jerusalem, after our Lord's ascension, they are described as meeting together in an upper room, and "these all continued *with one acord* in prayer and supplication." Now they could not have done it

"*with one accord*," had they not used some known form. No doubt it was their Lord's own prayer that they used, and others (as He had commanded) "*after that* MANNER." If one had spoken before the rest knew what was about to be said, how could they have joined "with one accord"?

The same expression occurs again in the fourth chapter of the Acts. They had met together in their affliction, and it is said, "they lifted up their voice to God with *one accord*, and said"—and then follow the words of a prayer in which they all joined: "Lord, thou art God, which hast made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that therein is," and so continuing. Now add to this some passages taken from the epistles (1 Cor. i, 14), where the Apostle is speaking of the gifts of the Spirit, how even they should not be exercised to the detriment of the *understanding*; "When thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say *Amen* at thy giving thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest, for thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified." "How is it, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation?" Now in this place the Apostle is finding fault with the Corinthians for the very thing which would correspond with extemporaneous prayer. Remembering the difference of time,—that then they practised the gifts of the Spirit,—there they were each with his own psalm, his own doctrine, and no doubt his own prayer: nothing was done jointly. The unlearned could not say "Amen"; it was all confusion. For this he reproves them; and therefore we may infer that one prayer for all,—a common prayer, in which all could join with the understanding as well as the spirit,—was that which the Apostle would approve. And then he concludes: "Let all things be done decently"; and let us mark this word, for it conveys much (and the Greek words from which it is translated convey even more) against the irregularity and uncertainty which there must be in an extemporaneous form of worship—"Let all things be done decently and IN ORDER."

Passing on from the Scripture times, we have now to

see the custom of the primitive Churches. We find indeed extant Liturgies, bearing the names of S. Mark and S. James; but the dates of these Liturgies are uncertain, and it does not appear that S. Mark and S. James were the real authors of them. We will waive these, then, and come to those writers who speak occasionally of a liturgical form of prayer. If it be asked why there are not any of the ancient Liturgies used in any of the primitive Churches now to be produced, the answer is, that in those times there was not one universal form, such as our own, in which all the Churches joined, but each bishop constructed his Liturgy, for the private use, as it were, of his own Church; and so the knowledge and practice of these Liturgies being confined to very small territories, they have not been preserved. But there is abundant proof of their existence. In the first century, Josephus, the Jewish historian, says: "The Essenes [that is, the Christians] rise up before the sun, and offer unto God certain prayers according to the custom of their forefathers, which prayers they have received from *them*."* Clemens Romanus, one of the earliest Christian writers, speaks of Liturgies, and uses the very word, and in the same sense in which we now use it. There had been a schism in the Church of Corinth, and Clement writes an epistle to the Corinthians, with directions how to correct the disorders which had sprung up amongst them; and then he says: "Let all things be done in order, whatever the Lord has commanded; and let the oblations and Liturgies be celebrated at the appointed times."† And in another place he says: "The clergy are in their proper place to offer up the Eucharist to God, and with all gravity to keep close to the determined *canon of the Liturgies*."‡ Ignatius also, of the same century, says thus: "The Christians have one prayer and one supplication *in common*."

In the second century, Justin Martyr says: "We all rise, and *in common* send up our prayers to God."§ And

* Josephus de Bello Jud. lib. ii c. 12

† Clemens Romanus, Ep. Cor. i. s. 40, ed. Jacobson.

‡ Ibid. s. 41, ed. Jacobson. § Justin, Apol. ii. p. 97.

S. Chrysostom, explaining the word *common*, says that it means prayers spoken alternately between the priest and the people,—such as our responses at this day. Again, Clement of Alexandria says: "The Christians prayed as having one common voice, and one mind."* And Tertullian, another of the Fathers, exhorting the Christians not to go to the Pagan shows, asks them "how they could clap those hands to a stage player, which had been lifted up to God in supplication? how they could give testimony to a gladiator with that mouth which had pronounced 'Amen' in the Sacrament, and had said the words 'World without end.'"† It is evident from this, that the people took their part in public prayer, and that what they said was well known to them.

In the third century we find a very remarkable passage by Hippolytus. He is giving the signs of the coming of Antichrist; and he says, "When Antichrist shall come, Liturgies shall cease, singing of psalms shall cease, and reading of Scripture shall not be heard."‡ Origen gives us one of the collects which were in use at his time, and after reciting the words, which begin thus: "O, Almighty God, grant us a part with the prophets;" he then adds, "and the *people* used frequently to say, Lord give us a part with the prophets."§ Here, then, again the people are found joining in a form of prayer known to them. S. Cyprian, another writer of that period, gives us these words as then in use in the Church: "Lift up your hearts"; and then the response of the people, "We lift them up unto the Lord,"‖ which words will of course be immediately recognized as the exact form of our own Liturgy to this very day.

Beyond the third century I do not think we need any further proof. Shortly after this period we have direct Liturgies:—the Liturgy of S. Basil and the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom. S. Basil, speaking of the Church of Neo-

* Clemens Alex. Strom. 7, c. 6, p. 848, ed. Oxon.
† Tertullian. De Spect. c. 25.
‡ Hippolytus, De Consumm. Mundi. Bib. Patr. tom. ii. p. 357.
§ Origen, Hom. in Jerem. ii. p. 606.
‖ Cyprian. De Orat. Dom. p. 152.

cæsarea, says that there had been in use in that Church a Liturgy for many years. He endeavoured to introduce among them a different way of singing, but so tenacious were they of their own Liturgy, that they would not suffer one ceremony, one word, or one mystical form, to undergo any alteration. So also we learn from Cyril of Jerusalem. He gives us forms for the Eucharist, and forms for the baptismal service. He specially mentions these words, which you will directly recognize: "Lift up your hearts. We lift them up unto the Lord. Let us give thanks to the Lord. It is meet and just so to do." And then he adds: "After this we make mention of heaven, and earth, the sea, the sun, moon, and stars, and the whole creation, and then we sing the seraphical hymn—Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Sabaoth."

I am sure, my brethren, that no more need be said to shew you the customs of the early Christian Churches. We have abundant witness here that in all the churches founded by the Apostles, and by the immediate successors of the Apostles,—and tracing them onwards from Apostolical times even to the present, we have abundant witness both in the east and in the west; in short, we have abundant testimony throughout the whole world that Christians worshipped God by set and appointed forms, and what is more, we do not hear of any other way. We do not hear of anything like any extemporaneous prayer; we do not hear it suggested as even possible. We do not hear of the congregation being left to merely listen to one set over them, to pray *for* them and not *with* them. It is always a joint, a common, a general prayer, in which priest and people had alternate parts. They were prayers *written, known, acknowledged;* prayers appointed by their bishops, and persons in authority; prayers, in fact, fulfilling in every respect our present notion and practice of a Liturgy.

At this point then we may fitly conclude the present portion of our subject. But it is obvious that, after all, men may agree on the principle of a common form of prayer, and yet not agree on the way in which the Church of England has carried that principle into effect. We

know that such was the case in the time of the *Protectorate*. At that period of our history the Book of Common Prayer was banished from among us as a relic of popery; but still, even then, the *principle* of a common form was upheld by the appointment of what was called *The Directory*.

It may be pretended, indeed, that the Directory was not a common form, as it did not furnish the actual words, but rather suggested heads of prayer, and gave general plans for the guidance of the minister, and nothing more. But, in reality, if we come closely to sift the matter, we shall find the Directory even still more binding and stringent than the Prayer Book. For instance, the Directory states thus:

"The congregation being assembled, the minister, after solemn calling on them to the worshipping the great name of God, is to begin with prayer. In all reverence and humility acknowledging the incomprehensible greatness and majesty of the Lord..... beseeching Him for pardon, assistance, and acceptance, in the whole service then to be performed," &c.

Then we have in order the following rules:

"*Of Public Prayer before Sermon.*—To acknowledge our great sinfulness. First, by reason of original sin, &c. .....next, by reason of actual sins, &c.

"To bewail our blindness of mind, hardness of heart, unbelief, impenitency, security, lukewarmness, barrenness, &c.....

"To acknowledge and confess that, as we are convinced of our guilt, we judge ourselves unworthy of the smallest benefits, &c.....

"Notwithstanding all which, to draw near to the throne of grace, encouraging ourselves with a hope, &c.....

"To pray for all in authority, especially for the king's majesty, &c....."

And then the whole direction terminates thus:

"We judge this to be a *convenient order*, in the ordinary public prayers, yet so as the minister may defer, as in prudence he shall think meet, some part of these petitions, till after his sermon, or offer up to God *some of the thanksgivings* HEREAFTER APPOINTED, in his prayer before his sermon."

Here then we have a "*convenient order*" mentioned, and "*thanksgivings appointed;*" the *way*, the *time*, the *subjects* directed.—"*We judge.*" . . .

Then follow rules for preaching, and subjects for preaching, entering into the most minute particulars: the text, the analysis of the text, its division, the length of the sermon, the doctrine, the argument, in dehortation, reprehension, admonition, applying comfort, and the like,

Then follow directions *after sermon.* Then forms for baptism and the communion, with prayers suggested, exhortation, warning, invitation; observing very much the order of the Prayer Book, only in baptism the minister is *not* to sign with the cross, as in communion the communicants are *not* to kneel, but "*sit about a table.*" Why so? Is there not just as much infringement of the rights of private judgment in forbidding the one, and commanding the other, as in the Prayer Book it is the reverse, commanding the sign of the cross, and forbidding the sitting round a table? If liberty is to be consulted, why not allow every person to do as he likes?

But to continue. Prayers are directed for the consecration of the elements; and in their distribution the following words are directed to be used. For the bread:

"According to the institution, command, and example of our Lord Jesus Christ, I take this bread, and having given thanks I break it, and give it unto you. Take ye. Eat ye. This is the body of Christ, which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of Him."

For the cup:

"According to the institution, command, and example of our Lord Jesus Christ, I take this cup and give it unto you. This cup is the New Testament in the blood of Christ, which is shed for the remission of the sins of many. Drink ye all of it."

Now what do we find in the above? Do we not find all the forms of public worship dictated and regulated quite as much as they are in the Book of Common Prayer? If it be said that these are only suggestions, not commands,—that they are not fixed upon the people,—then we reply by turning to the ordinances which were published by the

Parliament for bringing in this Directory. And we find it thus:

"The Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament do ordain that the knights and burgesses of the several counties shall send printed books of the said Directory, fairly bound up in leather, unto the Committees of Parliament residing in the said several counties.....And it is hereby ordered that the constables and other officers shall deliver the said books unto the several and respective ministers of the parishes. And it is hereby further ordained by the said Lords and Commons that the said several ministers shall, on the next Lord's day after the receipt of the said books of the Directory, before the morning sermon, openly read in their several churches and chapels the said Directory. And it is further ordained that every minister who shall at any time read the Book of Common Prayer, in any public place of worship, or in any private place or family, shall forfeit and pay, &c....and for the third offence shall suffer *one whole year's imprisonment.* And it is further ordained that every minister who shall not henceforth pursue and observe the Directory.....or shall bring the Directory into contempt or neglect, or raise opposition against it, shall forfeit and pay, &c....."

Now what can be said? Forms commanded, and penalties imposed upon their non-observance. Liberty of conscience urged against one book, but liberty of conscience destroyed and bound down with reference to another book. Words found fault with, as dictating to ministers in one case; yet words commanded, and ministers restrained to them, in the other. One book thrown aside, because it is a book and a form; but yet another book substituted, equally a form. We are indeed very delighted to pull motes out of our brother's eye, leaving beams in our own. If the Church has ever erred in exacting uniformity with a high and oppressive hand, the sectarian has erred in a tenfold degree, whenever he has obtained the power.* If the Church has ruled with whips, the

* Uniformity is confessedly the object of a Liturgy; and uniformity was just as much the object of the Directory. Binding down

sectarian has verily ruled with scorpions. It only proves thus much, that speak as we may in theory on liberty of conscience and freedom of opinion in the public worship of God,—when we come to practice, we of necessity come to forms of some description. What form is best is one question, and on this we may differ; that some form is necessary, we are all driven to acknowledge.

The question, then, which will next come before us will be this: the history and elucidation of that particular sort of Liturgy which belongs to our own Church. And this, in order to shew that not only are we satisfied of the principle of praying together in *some* common form: but, further than this, that that particular common form which we now use in the Church, is *good, sound, and founded upon primitive and Apostolic practice.* This, with the blessing of God, shall be our endeavour in the following Sermons. But for the present we may well conclude with some remarkable passages from two of our most eminent Church writers:—the one as eminent for his controversial writings against the corruptions of the Church of Rome, as the other for his writings against the Puritans and Non-conformists.

the minority by rules, though to their displeasure, for the sake of the peace of all, is the object of our standard form of prayer; but it was no less so in the Book of the Directory. The form of the covenant by which, in Charles the First's reign, the Puritans, Independents, and others, bound themselves to propagate their tenets, ran in this fashion:

"According to our respective places and offices, we will sincerely, seriously, and constantly, endeavour to maintain the Reformed religion established in the Church of Scotland, with regard to doctrine, worship, discipline, and ecclesiastical government, against the common enemies thereof, and to reform religion in the kingdoms of England and Ireland, in doctrinal worship, discipline, and government, pursuant to the Word of God, and the example of the best Reformed Churches. We will likewise endeavour to bring the Churches of God in these three kingdoms *to the closest union, agreement, and uniformity possible, in the confession of faith, in the form of ecclesiastical government, in the Directory, Catechism, and worship*; that ourselves and our posterity may live in the same profession of faith, and maintain a friendly and Christian correspondence, and that the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us."—*Collier*, part ii, book ix.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says thus :—he is speaking of the Church throughout all ages—" I never yet saw any instance, example, or pretence of any bishop, priest, or layman, that ever prayed extempore in the Church ; and although in some places single bishops, or peradventure other persons of less authority, did oftentimes bring prayers of their own into the Church, yet they ever were *compositions* and *premeditations*, and were brought thither there to be repeated often, and added to the Liturgy".*

The great and learned Hooker says thus : " No doubt from God it hath proceeded, and by us it must be acknowledged a work of singular care and Providence, that the Church hath evermore held a prescript form of common prayer, although not in all things everywhere the same, yet for the most part retaining still the same analogy. So that if the Liturgies of all ancient Churches throughout the world be compared amongst themselves, it may easily be perceived they had all one original mould, and that the public prayers of the people of God, in Churches thoroughly settled, did never use to be voluntary dictates proceeding from any man's extemporal wit. To him which considereth the grievous and scandalous inconveniences, whereunto they make themselves daily subject, with whom any blind and secret corner is judged a fit house of common prayer; the manifold confusions which they fall into, when every man's private spirit and gift (as they term it) is the only bishop that ordaineth him to this ministry; the irksome deformities whereby, through endless and senseless effusions of indigested prayers, they oftentimes disgrace in most unsufferable manner the worthiest part of Christian duty towards God ; who herein are subject to no certain order, but pray both what and how they list ; to him, I say, who weigheth duly all these things, the reasons cannot be obscure why God doth in public prayer so much respect *the solemnity of places where, the authority and calling of persons by whom,* and the *precise appointment even of words and sentences by which,* His name should be called upon amongst his people."†

* Apology for Authorized and Set Forms, p. 368, vol. vii.

† Ecclesiastical Polity, v, 25.

SERMON III.

HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

Psalm lxxviii, 6.

"*That their posterity might know it, and the children which were yet unborn; to the intent that when they came up they might shew their children the same.*"

Having now ascertained, both from reason and from Holy Scripture, the general principles upon which public prayer should be offered up as a service to Almighty God, our next step will be to examine that particular form of public prayer which our own Church has set before us. The subject of the present Lecture will therefore be the History of the Book in which this form is contained.

We cannot do better than take up The Preface just as it stands in that book, and from thence, as a ground-work, make such comments and explanations as the subject may demand.

THE PREFACE.

It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her Publick Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it. For, as on the one side common experience sheweth, that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established (no evident necessity so requiring) sundry inconveniences have thereupon ensued; and those many times more and greater than the evils, that were intended to be remedied by such change: So on the other side, the particular Forms of Divine worship, and the Rites and Ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent, and alterable, and so acknowledged; it is but reasonable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that

are in place of Authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient. Accordingly we find, that in the reigns of several Princes of blessed memory since the Reformation, the Church, upon just and weighty considerations her thereunto moving, hath yielded to make such alterations in some particulars, as in their respective times were thought convenient: Yet so, as that the main Body and Essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all the vain attempts and impetuous assaults made against it, by such men as are given to change, and have always discovered a greater regard to their own private fancies and interests, than to that duty they owe to the publick.

We here find the Book of Common Prayer spoken of under the term *Liturgy*. More properly speaking this word should be restricted to the Service of the Communion, as we generally find ancient writers using it with reference to that office only. Here, however, it is used in a larger and more comprehensive sense, as embracing *all* the offices of public prayer; and so in this larger sense I have already used it, and shall continue so to do in the following pages. The word is derived from the Greek Λειτουργία,* which signified in its first meaning, *the public ministration of an office in the state;* but it was afterwards confined to the public ministration of *religious offices*. It is a composition of two words—λειτος, which signifies *public;* and ἔργον, which signifies *work:* so that the two put together make λειτεργον, or λειτεργία, or, in English, LITURGY; and now by the common custom of Christians from the very earliest times, signifies "*The public work of Prayer.*" When we thus find in the Preface that the Church of England speaks of "*compiling her public*

* λειτουργία, ministerium publicum, munus publicum. Apud Polyb. sæpe de muneribus seu ministeriis castrensibus. Item generalius pro quovis ministerio, apud Luc. et apud Aristot. Œcon. 2. ¶ Item *publicum Ecclesiæ munus seu functio muneris alicujus ecclesiastici.* Item ministerium quod obitur *circa cultum Dei.* Theodoret. lib. iv. Hist. Eccles. Item peculiariter cœna Domini, sicut et ἱερουργία apud quosdam Theologos. Dicitur et de beneficentia in pauperes, 2 Cor. 9.—*Scapulæ Lexicon, ἔργον.*

The expression of S. Paul here alluded to is ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτεργιάς, which is translated in our version, "The administration of this service."

Liturgy," she means of course the drawing up certain general forms in which her members are to perform their public work of prayer. Now this compiling was not the business of a day. Though there always has been in this country, ever since it became a Christian country, *some* sort of public form of prayer, yet it has not always been exactly that which we now use. It has not always been the same either in language, or in doctrine, or in ceremonies. The use of the very word "*compiling*" shews that it is not an original book. That which is compiled, is that which is taken from some pre-existing source, and selected, and put together. It will be then for us to see *what* this source was. From what was our Liturgy compiled?

Many people imagine that the Church of England has only been a Church since the time of the Reformation—that there never was any Church peculiarly of our own country, except that Church which was under the dominion and government of Rome. There is no more fertile source of error than this. A national British Church has existed in these islands from the second century at latest—we might almost say from the time of the Apostles, and that quite irrespective of Rome. By some it is said that Britain was converted by James the son of Zebedee, others say Simon Zelotes, others Joseph of Arimathea, but a more satisfactory tradition imputes the conversion of the British to no less a person than S. Paul the Apostle of the Gentiles,* while it is at the same time said that the Aris-

* S. Clement of Rome says that S. Paul preached the Gospel throughout the whole world, and came to the *utmost bounds of the West*. Britain must of course be included in that expression: *δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τόν κόσμον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθών*.—Ad Cor. Ep. i.

Eusebius says, quoted by Bp. Stillingfleet, that "some of the Apostles preached the Gospel in the British islands." Theodoret says (tom. iv. serm. ix,) that "S. Paul brought salvation to the islands that lie in the ocean." S. Jerome says that "S. Paul having been in Spain, went from one ocean to another, imitating the motion and course of the Sun of Righteousness, of whom it is said, his going forth is from the end of heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it, and that his diligence in preaching extended as far as the earth itself."—"Imitans Dominum suum et Solem justitiæ de quo legimus,

tobolus mentioned by S. Paul in the epistle to the Romans, was the first bishop. Those who favour a Romish origin for our Church, would advert to the tradition of Lucius, as being the first Christian king, about the year 180. It is said that this king sent for advice, in regard to the Christian faith, to Eleutherius the bishop of Rome, and a letter is said to be extant from that pope in reply. In this letter Eleutherius advises the king on many important subjects, but it by no means follows that Christianity should not have already existed in Britain, even if this letter be genuine. The letter itself, however, is considered by the best historians as a spurious document, and not to be trusted. It might be allowed, indeed, that this king laid the foundation of the first British see, and that great celebrity attached to his name, as the first who to any extent endowed the Church with lands, and favoured it with his countenance and authority as a portion of the State,*—but it by no means appears that Lucius was unacquainted with Christianity at the time of his communication with Eleutherius. The first date at which we can place any attempt at a

'A summo cœlo egressio ejus, et occursus ejus ad summum ejus,' utante eum terra deficeret quam stadium prædicandi."—Hieronym. in Amos. c. v. And there are many similar passages scattered throughout the Fathers. Upon the whole, Bishop Stillingfleet, whose learned work should be consulted on this matter ("The antiquities of the British Churches," chapter i), comes decidedly to the conclusion that S. Paul, and no other, was the first preacher of the Gospel in Britain. He sums up the question as follows: "So much may suffice to show the greater probability that the Christian Church in Britain was rather founded by S. Paul than by S. Peter, or any other Apostle." And Soames, in the History of the Anglo-Saxon Church, says thus: "Upon the whole, therefore, a native of our island may fairly consider the great Apostle of the Gentiles as not improbably the founder of his national Church." — *Soames*, Hist. Anglo-Saxon Church, Introduction.

* Geoffry of Monmouth, says that "king Lucius not only granted all the lands belonging to the heathen temples to the churches built by him, but likewise made a great addition from his own patrimonial revenue."—See *Collier*, Eccl. Hist. book i, cent. iv. And by referring to the same history, book i, cent. ii, the reader will see what the extent of these benefactions to the Church must have been; some attributing the building of the Church at Westminster to him; also a Chapel at Dover Castle; also S. Martin's at Canterbury, a Church at Bangor, and a Church and Monastery at Winchester.

junction between the two Churches of England and Rome, would be the year of our Lord 596. At this period S. Augustin received his commission from Pope Gregory, and, coming to England, founded the archbishopric of Canterbury. But long prior to this, we find the existence of an organized British Church, and British bishops.* There were British bishops at the council of Arles, A.D. 314; again at the council of Sardica, A.D. 347; again at the council of Ariminum, A.D. 539.† It is quite certain, also,

* In a remarkable work on the antiquities of the ancient Cambrian Church, by the Rev. John Williams,—a work which abounds in information of every kind regarding our Church,—it is said that the order of the foundation of the British sees was, first Landaf, second York, and third London.

"The three archbishoprics of the isle of Britain:

"The first, Landaf, founded by Lleirwg, the son of Coel, the son of Cyllin, who first gave land and national privileges to those who embraced the faith of Christ.

"The second York, founded by the emperor Constantine, who was the first of the Roman emperors who embraced the Christian faith.

"The third, London, founded by the emperor Maesen Wledig (Maximus)."—*Williams*, Eccl. Antiq. of the Cymry.

† Many documents of great importance have no doubt perished, by which the independence of the British Churches might otherwise have been proved. Among those that do, however, survive, no one perhaps is so satisfactory as the record of the council of Arles. The names of the bishops who subscribed the canons of this council are preserved, and among them we find as follows:

"Eborius, episcopus de civitate Eboracensi, provinciâ Britanniâ.

"Restitutus, episcopus de civitate Londinensi, provinciâ superscriptâ.

"Adelfius, episcopus de civitate coloniæ Londinensium, exinde sacerdos, presbyter, et Arminius diaconus."

Labbe et Cossart, Concil. tom. i, p. 267.

Here then we have, according to the known rule of the councils, the bishop, with his attendant priest and deacon, as representing in three provinces the British Church. With regard to the last of the three, "de civitate coloniæ Londinensium," it probably means *Landaf*, that see being frequently confounded with Caerleon; and Caerleon, we know, was a colony of the second legion.

At the council of Sardica, we have the testimony of Athanasius that British bishops were present. See Usher's British Antiquities, p. 105.

At the council of Ariminum, we have the testimony of Sulpitius Severus that British bishops were present. Speaking of the way in which the bishops were received and treated, he says: "Three only

that the British Christians suffered to a great extent in the Diocletian persecution about the year 300, and the name of S. Alban, our proto-martyr, is conspicuous. All these historical facts clearly prove to us the existence of our own Church irrespective of that of Rome.

The same truth may also be inferred from the circumstances which attended the arrival of S. Augustin in England. It is said that seven British bishops met in conference with the Roman monk, at a place in Worcestershire called Augustin's oak;—that a formal demand was made on the part of S. Augustin, that the British bishops should resign their peculiar customs, and submit themselves to the jurisdiction of Rome. "Since in many things," said Augustin, "*ye act contrary to our customs*, and to that of the universal Church, and yet if ye will obey me in these three points—that ye celebrate the passover at the proper time; that ye perform the service of baptism, by which we are born again to God, after the manner of the holy Roman and Apostolic Church, and that ye preach with us the word of God to the nation of the Angles; as for the other things which ye do, *although contrary to our customs*, we will bear them with all patience." To which the British bishops replied, "We will perform none of these things, neither will we have thee for our archbishop."* In this narrative we find three very remarkable particulars. First we find seven British bishops in existence, to whom S. Augustin came; next we find that S. Augustin recognized them as bishops, and invited them, as orthodox, and sufficient to join with him in the conversion of the Angles—by which is meant the Anglo-Saxons: and next we find that these seven bishops, as representing their Church, had customs peculiar to themselves, and those *contrary to Rome*. Of these customs

from Britain, on account of poverty, made use of the public gift."—*Sulp. Sev.* Sacr. Hist. lib. ii, cap. iv.

Of the intervening council of Nice, which preceded Sardica, and was eleven years after that of Arles, we have not indeed any direct testimony that British bishops were present; but the probability that there were some present is very great, as may be seen by reference to Collier, Eccl. Hist. cent. iv.

* Bede, lib. ii, c. ii.

S. Augustin himself mentions the principal one—the time of keeping Easter. The British Churches kept Easter according to the Asiatic custom, which was contrary to the Roman. And this proves the origin of our Church to have been, directly or indirectly, from Asia. And if the custom of thus keeping Easter was Asiatic, it would in all probability follow that the Liturgy was also Asiatic. Now we learn from other sources that the Liturgy used in Britain at this time was the Gallican, and it would naturally be so, as derived from the country nearest to Britain. But the Gallican Liturgy was in its origin Asiatic, being traceable from Lyonsto Smyrna, through Irenæus bishop of Lyons, to Polycarp, and from Polycarp to the Apostle S. John himself.*

Now let us sum up all these facts together. What a chain of proof do they convey that the British Church is prior in its existence to any communication with Rome, and independent of it! What do we here find as well ascertained historical facts? We find a Church, organized, established, and endowed, with its bishops, priests, and deacons. We find customs prevailing *contrary to Rome*, and yet tracing their origin to the oriental Churches through the Church of Gaul. We find a Liturgy in the same manner opposed to Rome, and yet in its tone and language betraying evident signs of an Apostolical origin. And all this we find acknowledged by the emissary of the bishop of Rome: and upon his attempt to subdue the British Church, and incorporate it with his own Church, we find for many years a determined and a successful resistance.

These things are, indeed, sufficiently clear. I have dwelt at length upon this subject, because upon it hangs everything that can strengthen and confirm the conviction of our Apostolic origin. Let it be a truth never to be lost sight of:—and when the emissaries of Rome, as at the present day, would ask, as often with an ignorant confidence they

* The reader should refer for fuller information on this interesting subject to the learned work of Mr. Palmer, Origines Liturgicæ, vol. i, § ix.

do—"*Where was our Church before the Reformation?*" Let us reply by these incontrovertible facts, as testifying that in this country *the Church of England is prior to the Church of Rome;* that we were here in possession of the land, endowed with bishoprics, and customs, and a Liturgy, hundreds of years before Rome had any dealings with us: that when she did have dealings with us, it was as a visitor, and a foreigner; that when she did first invite us to join with her, we rejected her; that when she would place over us the archbishopric of Canterbury as the seat of the primacy, she was told that the original primacy—that which had long existed before Canterbury was thought of—was Caerleon; that there, and at Landaf, prelates had governed the Church for ages preceding. I repeat, over and over again, let these historical facts sink deep down into every one's mind, when they come to argue about the claim of the Church of Rome to our obedience, or the supremacy of the chair of S. Peter.

These facts, then, being well remembered, let us now proceed to see how it was that the Church of Rome did finally prevail among us; or in other words, what was the issue of the mission of S. Augustin? It was this:—After the departure of the Romans from England, the eastern parts of our island were overcome by savage heathen tribes, coming from Jutland and Saxony. These tribes gradually drove the Christian inhabitants of the land, together with their Church and bishops, into the west, they themselves taking possession of the country, and becoming its governors. S. Augustin's mission was to convert these heathen Saxons, not to convert the British; hence the meaning of his demand of the British bishops to join him in preaching the word of God to the Angles. While the ancient Church of England was confined within the regions of Cambria, by the strength of her Saxon invaders, the new and foreign Church of Rome made progress among the heathen conquerors; but she left the ancient Church for a considerable time unmolested, not being able to form a junction with her, by reason of her different customs, and her unwillingness to acknowledge her as in any degree superior.

In considering what the state of things must have been in this country in the early ages of the Gospel, we must steadily keep in view the difference between the Saxons, or Anglo-Saxons, and the British. You must picture to yourself, for the first centuries, a primitive and apostolic church of our original native people; then, when foreign aggressors, principally the Saxons, drove out Christianity from those parts of the island which they conquered, you must picture to yourself that Church retiring in weakness and persecution, but still existing. Then, it being known at Rome that great masses of the conquerors in the southern and eastern parts of England were in heathenism, you must picture to yourselves S. Augustin and his monks sent over to convert that mass of heathenism. Then, S. Augustin, prevailing with the Anglo-Saxons, and converting them to Christianity, you must picture to yourself two separate Churches,—S. Augustin and the Church of Rome prevailing in the south and east,—the ancient British Church, with her original bishops, prevailing in the west. Then, as time advanced, and the power of Rome increased, you must imagine the two Churches gradually merging into one, the British Churches losing their independence by degrees, and becoming, partly through violence, partly through political intrigue, subject to the dominion of their more powerful rival. Then, you must imagine, as the light of God's word seemed for a period to be obscured by the inroad of barbarous nations,—the Saracens, and afterwards the Turks, in the *East*, and the Normans in the *West*,—then, I say, you must imagine superstition increasing with ignorance, and false doctrines prevailing; the Holy Scriptures perverted, and the customs and ceremonies of primitive times obscured by a mixture of heathen display and religious fanaticism. All this you must rapidly picture in the mind; and you will easily see how it was that the Church of England, the ancient British Church, was lost sight of in this general confusion, and became merged, as all the rest of Europe was, in everything pertaining to internal regulation, and to faith and action, in the corruptions which prevailed at Rome.

But still, all through this time, our national Church, though obscured, yet lived. Her bishops still were the bishops of the land, and though incorporated with Rome, they were our bishops. Her Liturgy continued, and though it was incorporated with that of Rome, still it was our Liturgy, and the people for ages continued in the use of their own public prayers handed down to them from their ancestors, and were joined by bonds of union with the Church Catholic throughout the world.

But it behoves us now to consider the foundation of our Liturgy as it now exists. Whatever might have been the difference between the ancient British Liturgy and the Roman, certain it is, that the Roman did prevail over the British, and the Anglo-Saxon Liturgy, introduced by S. Augustin, from Gregory, did become the Liturgy of the whole realm. "In fact," says a recent writer on this subject, "the Liturgical books of the Anglo-Saxon Church in subsequent times were nothing else but transcripts of the sacramentary of Gregory."* As the Church prevailed, so did the Liturgy.

But for a clearer understanding of the state of things, as we approach the sixteenth century, we must bear in mind these two points :—First, all through this long period of history of which I have been speaking, the prayers or offices of the Church were not collected into one book. There were *several* books. There was a Breviary, which contained the morning and evening prayers; and the Missal or Mass-Book, which contained the communion service; there was also the Hymnarium, containing hymns; the Collectarium, containing collects; the Ordinal, containing the ordination services; and the like.

Secondly, all these services and forms of prayer, dispersed as they were in different books, were by no means the same throughout the whole country. Each bishop, according to primitive custom, had the power of regulating his own Liturgy in his own diocese; consequently, although the spirit and system of all the prayers were alike, and agreed with the general Liturgies of the Church

* Palmer's Origines Liturgicæ, vol. i, p. 186.

Catholic, still there were many deviations in the different dioceses; and thus you read of "the Hereford use, the Salisbury use, the use of Bangor, York, and Lincoln," by which is meant that these dioceses had different customs in using their Liturgies.

These things being understood, and at the same time remembering the growing corruptions which prevailed throughout the whole of Christendom from the eighth or ninth century down to the sixteenth,—the people being ignorant and uneducated, the very highest ranks, even princes and kings, in the dark ages, not knowing how to read or write, the clergy debased, and in many cases profligate and wicked; all these things being taken into the account, we shall then understand what is meant in the Preface by "*compiling our Liturgy*,"—how many difficulties surrounded it, what different customs and usages, what conflicting authorities, what contending prejudices—how, from the various breviaries and missals then prevailing, the various uses which existed in the different dioceses, and more particularly the translation from a foreign language into the vernacular tongue—how from all these circumstances this compilation was a work of no trivial importance and delicacy.

We are now brought forward in the history of our Liturgy to the period of the Reformation. Those who are at all acquainted with the history of their country, know well how all-important to the interests of religion this period was. We have nothing in this place to say, as to its general aspect, its failures in some respects, its blessings in others, but simply now confining ourselves to its dealings with the Liturgical services of our Church, it will be our business to shew the gradual process by which the change was wrought from the breviary or missal as used in England before the Reformation, to the book of common prayer as used in England after the Reformation; always remembering that the breviary and missal were *our books;* not Romish books only, but *our* books,—Church of England books; and that we, as a Church, had a right, as we exercised that right, to change, improve, and reform them, *as our books.* The Reformation, we may say (speaking

generally), began in the reign of Henry VIII. At that time, our people seemed to be awaking out of a long sleep. They seemed to be desirous of shaking off the fetters of Rome by which they had so long been bound, and to return to their ancient ways ; to be again what they were before S. Augustin visited them in the year 596 ; to be again a national and independent church. Let us, however, recollect that they did not desire to make a schism in the Church, or to be separated from the Church Catholic, but only to reform and purify their own branch of it. They did not desire to make a *new* Church (which, indeed, was impossible), but to cleanse the impurities which had attached themselves to the old one ; they wished to be as they formerly had been, and by their own synods, and their own bishops, and their own sovereigns to be governed and directed. And this they accomplished.

The first attempt at reforming the Liturgy, and compiling that which now stands in our book of common prayer, was made by archbishop Cranmer in the year 1536. At that time, the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, were translated into English. This was the first step. For nine years this was the only part of the prayer book in English, the rest continuing in Latin as before. After this, a second step was taken ; and in the year 1545, the whole of the morning and evening prayer, much the same as we now use it, was appointed to be read in churches in the English tongue. After this, the *Litany* was translated ; and then, these translations being put together constituted what was called King Henry the Eighth's Primer.

Three years afterwards, in the reign of Edward VI, thirteen bishops and dignitaries of the Church were appointed to proceed in this good work. They betook themselves accordingly to the remaining part of the book—the communion office, the services for baptism, burial, churching of women, and all the other special offices—until at length the whole work was finished. It was ratified by act of parliament, and published in the year 1549. It is that which now goes by the name of King Edward's first Book. It is called the *first* book, because, four years

afterwards, Calvin, Bucer, and others, finding fault with certain parts of it as being superstitious, requested and procured a general review and reconsideration of its prayers and ceremonies. And so, as we read just now in the Preface,—"the particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent, it is but reasonable that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those that are in place of authority, should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient." Upon this principle that which is now called the *second* Book of Edward VI, was published in the year 1552. Several alterations had been made, both in language and ceremonial observances. These alterations are looked upon with more or less approbation by different parties in the Church. It would seem upon the whole that they were not improvements.*

* The main points of difference between the first and second Books of Edward VI are the following: In the first Book the service begins with the Lord's Prayer; consequently there is no Confession or Absolution, those duties being left for the Communion office. In the first Book there was no collect for the king or royal family, clergy and people. In the first Book there is a holy day appointed to be observed, which is entirely omitted in the second Book,—namely, the feast of S. Mary Magdalen (July 22nd). The collect for this festival was as follows:

"Merciful Father, give us grace that we never presume to sin through the example of any creature; but if it shall chance us at any time to offend thy divine Majesty, that then we may truly repent, and lament the same after the example of Mary Magdalen, and by lively faith obtain remission of all our sins, through the only merits of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."

The daily service in the first Book terminated at the third collect. The Athanasian Creed, in the first Book, was appointed to be said only on the great festivals. The Litany was only used on Wednesdays and Fridays,—*not on Sundays.* In the first Book there were introits, or particular psalms, to be sung at the commencement of the Communion; and the title of the Communion office was thus,—"*commonly called the Mass.*" There were many vestures also for the bishop and priest ordered in the first Book,—albes, and tunicles, and copes; but in the second Book we do not find these, and throughout the Communion office altogether there is much less of a triumph-

After the reign of Edward, the labours of our first great Reformers were thrown back for awhile. The Roman Church again prevailed, and in the reign of Mary our book of common prayer made way for the return of the breviary and missal. But it was only for a while. Elizabeth, upon her accession to the throne, immediately restored it. The same book as that of Edward VI, with some few alterations and amendments, was again produced, and in the year 1569 proclaimed and published by Act of Parliament. The Church was again reinstated in her privileges, and the Popes of Rome, from that time up to the present, have never been able to gain that ascendancy in our councils, or that affection in the hearts of our people, which they lost upon the death of Mary.

But, alas! the Church has had many more enemies to contend against than the Popes of Rome,—enemies of a far more dangerous character, because within herself. No

ant and joyful character in the second Book than in the first, and more of a penitential feeling scattered throughout. For instance, in the first Book the "Gloria in excelsis" was at the commencement of the service, now it is postponed to the termination, and in its place the Ten Commandments, with a penitential response; and in the first Book the prayer for Christ's Church militant was just before the consecration, and in it were these words, now omitted:

"And here we do give thee most high praise and most hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy Saints, from the beginning of the world, and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesus Chrst our Lord God, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs, whose examples, O Lord, and stedfastness in thy faith and keeping thy commandments, grant us to follow. We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace; grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy and everlasting peace."

And then, in order to make the prayer correspond with its title, the words "*militant here on earth*," were added in the second Book, so as to take away the notion of praying for the dead. Also in the first Book water was directed to be used with the wine; and instead of unleavened bread, it was now directed to be "such as is usual to be eaten." The words both of consecration and at distribution were materially altered, and the sentence, "Take and eat this *in remembrance*," &c. added. In the expressions of the Rubrics also, there are several remarkable alterations, which, though only words

sooner does she shake off, with much cost of blood—the blood of some of her worthiest sons—the external dominion of a foreign Church, than her own friends turn against her, and they of her own household become her foes. Thus it was that, in the reign of James I, the Puritans, a stern and violent class of enthusiastic men, began to exclaim loudly against the force put upon their consciences, in having this public Liturgy thrust upon them. A conference was held at Hampton Court under Archbishop Whitgift, king James himself presiding. On the part of the Church were assembled eight bishops, six deans of cathedrals, two doctors of divinity, and one archdeacon. On the Puritan side were four learned men, two of Cambridge, and two of Oxford. This conference, however, did not terminate in any agreement on the points disputed; the only result was some few alterations of minor importance.* But the spirit which thus manifested itself

in some instances, still demonstrate a change of feeling; as, for instance, "table," "Lord's table," and "holy table," are substituted for "altar." All ceremonies of anointing, both in baptism, confirmation, and visitation of the sick, which were commanded in the first Book, were omitted in the second.

In the office of Matrimony, the ring, and gold and silver, being delivered to the priest, the sign of the cross was to be made,—now omitted; upon which Collier remarks:

"The sign of the cross is likewise a very ancient usage. Tertullian observes that in his time it was a general custom for Christians to make a cross on their foreheads, upon every the least remarkable occasion: 'ad omnem aditum et promotum,' &c. (Tertullian de Coron. Milit.) Thus the heathen Cæcilius in Minutius Felix, rallies the Christian for worshipping the cross. This supposes *the use of it.*"—*Collier*, book iv. It is needless to say that now the use of the sign of the cross is limited to holy baptism.

Thus I have mentioned the principal points of difference between the two Books; whether the alterations have been for the better or for the worse, every one has a right to determine for himself. Private opinions may charitably be indulged. Many great and good men have regretted the changes, and look back with reverential sorrow to many losses and few gains. Not being discontented with what God in His mercy has vouchsafed to preserve for His Church —God forbid—still it may without danger be said that the first book was in most respects a more faithful transcript of the ancient liturgies than the second.

* The principal objections brought forward at the Hampton Court Conference were the following:

in the reign of James I, did not slumber, nor was it content with mere protestations of words, or arguments in conferences. We know too well what was its issue in the succeeding reign. To Whitgift succeeded Abbot, and to Abbot, Laud, as Archbishop of Canterbury ; and every one who has read the history of his country, even with the slightest degree of attention, knows well how the names of Charles the First and Archbishop Laud are joined together as men suffering, even unto death, in the cause of the Church, against rebellion and Puritanism. Abbot was remiss and careless ; but Laud succeeding him, was doubly vigilant, active, and severe, to make up for the losses which the discipline of the Church had suffered. Hence his unpopularity. Hence the people, unwilling to submit to authority, broke out into that fearful rebellion which brought upon them the sin of the murder of their king.

This is not the place to enter into the particulars of that fearful history. Suffice it to say, that upon the martyrdom of the king and the archbishop (the respective heads of the State,—the temporal authority,—and of the Church, the spiritual), the Prayer Book, with all its ordinances and ceremonies, was abolished. The Directory took its place. Together with the Prayer Book, the bishops, priests and deacons, of the Church of England, were banished,

The reading of the Apocrypha as public lessons of the Church.
The use of the cross in baptism.
The use of the surplice.
The expression in the service of matrimony, "*With my body I thee worship.*"
The use of the ring in marriage.
The churching of women, under the title of "Purification."
The principal alterations made at this time were the following :
In the rubric of absolution, the words, "*or remission of sins,*" were added.
In private baptism, the words, "Let them that be present," were altered into, "*Let the lawful minister* and them that be present."
In the order of confirmation, some slight changes were made, as also in the service for public baptism.
Thanksgivings were added at the end of the Litany, "for rain," "for fair weather," "for peace," "for deliverance from the plague," and all that portion of the catechism which relates to the sacraments. This latter indeed was a most valuable addition, in regard to many points of most vital doctrine.

and deprived of their preferments. The Prayer Book was now called Papistical: the surplice, "a rag of Popery": the holy communion, the "mass in English." No one was permitted to perform divine service, but according to the Directory. If any did, it was in secret and by stealth, and at the risk of immediate persecution. In short, together with the Liturgy, both the Crown and the Church ceased, as far as anything visible might indicate it, to have any longer a part in the councils of the nation.*

But God in his mercy did not entirely desert us. The nation, having for a time revelled in a scene of violence, bloodshed and anarchy, truly dreadful, at length awoke as from a trance. Headstrong and ambitious men had for a time deceived the people;—men who, as the Preface says, "have always discovered a greater regard to their own private fancies and interests, than their duty to the public." But at length the deception was at an end. Sated and wearied with their own confusion, men panted for the old paths once more. Their king was restored, their clergy welcomed back, and the Book of Common Prayer re-established as the service book of the country. The first thing which Charles the Second did, upon his

* We say *visible*, because the Church in reality can never cease. God's promise is, that the gates of hell shall never prevail against it. It may suffer persecution, but shall never cease until the end of time. Thus, at this very period, though the bishops were deprived of their temporalities, yet they existed as bishops spiritually, either in England, or in those foreign countries to which they fled; and in many places the liturgy was still offered up in secret, though forbidden openly by the strong hand of force. Many anecdotes record this fact. For instance, it is recorded of the learned George Bull, when minister of S. George's: "He was sent for to baptize the child of a Dissenter, upon which occasion he made use of the office of baptism; but not daring to use the office openly as from the book, he said the words by heart. The bystanders did not know that they were the words of the Prayer Book, and expressed high gratification at what was said. But when the sign of the cross was faithfully made, according to the rubric, the Dissenter made his objection, stating that if it had not been for that, he should have been much pleased at his *excellent prayers*. Upon which Mr. Bull showed him that all he had said was word for word the *Prayer Book*,"—Abridged from Nelson's Life of Bull, pp. 39-40.

The reader should also consult Evelyn and Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy, for an account of those times.

restoration to the throne, was to appoint twelve of the most learned men on the part of the Church, and as many on the Puritan side, to see if any agreement could be entered into, by which both parties might be satisfied in a liturgical form of prayer. A conference was held at the Savoy, similar to that before at Hampton Court under king James. The instruction of the king was, "to compare the Book of Common Prayer with the most ancient Liturgies that had been used in the Church in the most primitive and purest times, but to avoid as much as possible all unnecessary alterations of the form of the Liturgy wherewith the people were altogether acquainted, and had so long received." But the Savoy Conference of king Charles ended no otherwise than the Hampton Court Conference of king James,—that is, without any satisfaction to either party. A report of the conference was given to the king to the following effect: "That the Church's welfare, unity and peace, and that his majesty's satisfaction, were ends upon which they were all agreed, but as to the means, they could not come to any harmony." There were, however, even at this last conference and review, a few alterations made,* some at the suggestions of the Presbyterian

* The principal objections urged by the Puritans at the Savoy Conference, were the following:

Against the responses of the people, urging that prayer ought to be from one voice, to prevent what they called confusion.

Against the Litany, for the same reason.

Against Lent as a religious fast.

Against the observance of Saints' days.

Against the Apocrypha, as read for lessons.

Against the Communion office, as being said at the altar.

Against the use of the word "priest."

Against speaking of Christians in communion with the Church as "regenerated."

Against the Collects, as being too short.

Against the use of several ceremonies, as the surplice, the sign of the cross, kneeling at the holy communion, &c. &c.

The principal alterations made at the Savoy Conference were the following:

The priest was directed to say the Absolution standing. The Gloria Patri was directed to be said after every division of the 119th Psalm. The words "rebellion and schism" were inserted in their place in the Litany. The prayer for "Ember Weeks," "the Par-

party, and others in accordance with the views of Churchmen themselves; and with these the Book of Common Prayer passed through Convocation and the Houses of Parliament. On the 16th of May 1662 it received the royal assent, and became the law of the land; and at the same time an act was passed, which is now in general prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer, called the Act of Uniformity. It is this act which to this day regulates the performance of divine service, and by which every bishop, priest and deacon, is bound most rigidly to adhere to all the provisions and rubrics of the Prayer Book. It was by this Act, still in force, that the book became the law of the land, as by the Act of Convocation it became the law of the Church.

Thus I have very rapidly sketched out a history of the progress of our Prayer Book and of the changes which it has undergone. With these particulars before us, we shall more readily understand the allusions which are contained in the Preface now under consideration. It will be well that we now go on to read the next portion of this preface, in which we shall easily perceive many references to the points of history through which we have gone: as "the confusions of the times," "his Majesty's happy restoration", "the late usurped powers," and

liament," for "All Sorts and Conditions of Men," and the "General Thanksgiving," were added. A Collect was appointed for Easter Eve. In the prayer for the Church Militant, the words "We also bless thy holy name for all thy servants departed this life," were added,—thus in some degree restoring the prayer to a nearer resemblance to the first Book of Edward VI. At the reading of the Nicene Creed and the Gospel, the people were directed to stand. Marginal Rubrics were added in the prayer of Consecration, directing the priest; and some Rubrics were omitted. In the office for Public Baptism, a question was added, "Wilt thou keep God's holy will and commandments?" In the consecration of the water, the words, "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin," were added. An entirely new office for the "Baptism of those of Riper Years," was added, to meet the case of Anabaptists, and others who had, in the civil wars, neglected that holy rite. Such were the main alterations, many of them of very great value, and none of them to be regretted, as principally being a return to the first Book of Edward VI.

the like; all which terms refer to the civil war, or to events immediately succeeding it. This portion of the Preface runs thus:—

By what undue means, and for what mischievous purposes the use of the Liturgy (though enjoined by the Laws of the Land, and those Laws never yet repealed) came, during the late unhappy confusions, to be discontinued, is too well known to the world, and we are not willing here to remember. But when, upon His Majesty's happy Restoration, it seemed probable, that, amongst other things, the use of the Liturgy would also return of course (the same having never been legally abolished) unless some timely means were used to prevent it; those men who under the late usurped powers had made it a great part of their business to render the people disaffected thereunto, saw themselves in point of Reputation and Interest concerned (unless they would freely acknowledge themselves to have erred, which such men are very hardly brought to do) with their utmost endeavours to hinder the restitution thereof. In order whereunto divers Pamphlets were published against the Book of *Common Prayer*, the old Objections mustered up, with the addition of some new ones, more than formerly had been made, to make the number swell. In fine, great importunities were used to His Sacred Majesty, that the said Book might be revised, and such Alterations therein, and Additions thereunto made, as should be thought requisite for the ease of tender Consciences: whereunto His Majesty, out of his pious inclination to give satisfaction (so far as could be reasonably expected) to all his subjects of what persuasion soever, did graciously condescend.

In which review we have endeavoured to observe the like moderation, as we find to have been used in the like case in former times. And therefore of the sundry alterations proposed unto us, we have rejected all such as were either of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some established Doctrine, or laudable Practice of the Church of *England*, or indeed of the whole Catholick Church of Christ) or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain. But such alterations as were tendered to us (by what persons, under what pretences, or to what purpose soever tendered) as seemed to us in any degree requisite or expedient, we have willingly, and of our own accord assented unto: not enforced so to do by any strength of Argument, convincing us of the necessity of making the said Alterations: For we are fully persuaded in our judgements (and we here profess it to the world) that the Book, as it stood before established by Law, doth not contain in it anything contrary to the Word of God, or to sound Doctrine, or which a godly man may not with a good Conscience use and submit unto, or which is not fairly defensible against any that shall oppose the same; if it shall be allowed such just and favourable construction as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human Writings, especially such as are set forth by Authority, and even to the very best translations of the holy Scripture itself.

Our general aim therefore in this undertaking was, not to gratify this or that party in any of their unreasonable demands; but to do that, which to our best understandings we conceived might most tend to the preservation of Peace and Unity in the Church; the procuring of Reverence, and exciting of Piety and Devotion in the publick Worship of God; and the cutting off occasion from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against the Liturgy of the Church. And as to the several variations from the former Book, whether by Alteration, Addition, or otherwise, it shall suffice to give this general account, That most of the Alterations were made, either first, for the better direction of them that are to officiate in any part of Divine Service; which is chiefly done in the Calendars and Rubricks: Or secondly, for the more proper expressing of some words or phrases of ancient usage in terms more suitable to the language of the present times, and the clearer explanation of some other words and phrases, that were either of doubtful signification, or otherwise liable to misconstruction: Or thirdly, for a more perfect rendering of such portions of holy Scripture, as are inserted into the Liturgy; which, in the Epistles and Gospels especially, and in sundry other places, are now ordered to be read according to the last Translation: and that it was thought convenient, that some Prayers and Thanksgivings, fitted to special occasions, should be added in their due places; particularly for those at Sea, together with an Office for the Baptism of such as are of riper years: which, although not so necessary when the former Book was compiled, yet by the growth of Anabaptism, through the licentiousness of the late times crept in amongst us, is now become necessary, and may be always useful for the baptizing of Natives in our Plantations, and others converted to the Faith. If any man, who shall desire a more particular account of the several Alterations in any part of the Liturgy, shall take the pains to compare the present Book with the former; we doubt not but the reason of the change may easily appear.

From this, it will be readily seen that the compilation of our Liturgy, as I said before, was not the hasty business of a day. How singularly are the marks of God's hand upon it! How remarkably has it grown up from Apostolic times to the present, passing through many vicissitudes indeed, but still coming forth true and just! Passing from the Liturgies of the east, it takes its place as a national formulary before the time of S. Augustin; then passing on, it becomes incorporated with the Liturgy of Rome; then passing on again, it shakes off the corruptions introduced by that Church, and returns to its primitive simplicity and purity as in the Apostolic times. Then subject again to the cavils of unrighteous men, and the

doubts and misgivings of scrupulous men, it undergoes examination after examination, review after review, and the scrutiny of conference after conference, until it comes forth to us at this present hour purged and sifted. It appears that, from the year 1545, when first its reformation was commenced, until the year 1662, when it was arranged upon the basis on which it now stands,—a period of one hundred and seventeen years—it was reviewed and reconsidered by the ablest, most learned, and we may add, the most Catholic men of the Church, with all the reasons which experience and adversity could dictate, and with the utmost ability of adversaries in opinion and power enlisted against them, determined to resist anything that might be erroneous. I repeat, with all these peculiar advantages, during a period of one hundred and seventeen years—a period of the most intense interest and importance in our history,—it was reviewed no less than sixteen times.

We, indeed, as members of the Church of Christ in this country, must faithfully and firmly hold by this book. It is the law of the land, as having received the authority of both houses of parliament and the royal assent; it is the law of the Church, as having received the assent of the convocation. Every Englishman, as a member of the national Church, is morally bound by its provisions, and though, indeed, he may have liberty of conscience, yet that liberty of conscience must not be made a cloak for licentiousness. An obedient spirit, as becometh a servant of Christ, would acquiesce in that which the Church as a Church provides, considering the Church as of God, her ways as His ways, her ordinances as His ordinances. Let us remember the vicissitudes which this Book has encountered in the history of our country, and the pains and cautious investigation with which the best and most learned divines of our Church have approached it; and if we do so, I think we shall agree, in the words of one of the most pious and most able of our prelates, lately deceased, (Bishop Jebb), that "it is not the work of one man, or of one society, or of one age; but that its materials were gradually formed, and safely deposited among the records of various churches,

eastern and western, more or less ancient. And when the time was ripe for its formation, its compilers were led, I verily believe, by a wisdom not their own, to proceed on the principle of rejecting whatever was peculiar to any sect or party, to any age or nation, and of retaining that sacred depositum which had the *sanction of all*. We have, indeed, in addition to the touchstone of sacred Scripture, the testimony of the *Catholic Church* to satisfy us, that this, our national commentary, is framed according to the analogy of faith."

And here this Lecture may be concluded, if we merely add the remainder of the Preface. Remember that this preface belongs to the last publication of the Liturgy. After the many troubles and hostile attacks which it had received at the hands of Puritan, Presbyterian, Anabaptist, Independent, and, in short, of every existing sect of dissent; it was in this way that the compilers at the last review called upon their countrymen, as we, the priests of the Church, now call upon you, to abide stedfastly in it;—not to heed the specious and unsound objections which men who love their own private fancies will continually urge against it, but to abide stedfastly —first, indeed in your BIBLE, but secondly, as agreeing with your Bible, in your BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

After the passage first read, the compilers thus conclude:—

> And having thus endeavoured to discharge our duties in this weighty affair, as in the sight of God, and to approve our sincerity therein (so far as lay in us) to the consciences of all men; although we know it impossible (in such variety of apprehensions, humours, and interests, as are in the world) to please all; nor can expect that men of factious, peevish, and perverse spirits should be satisfied with anything that can be done in this kind by any other than themselves: Yet we have good hope, that what is here presented, and hath been by the Convocations of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious Sons of the Church of *England*.

SERMON IV.

THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

DEUTERONOMY IV. 2.

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it."

THE middle path of the Church of England, both in her ritual and her Liturgy, is, in the estimation of all men of calm and dispassionate judgment, her singular beauty. This was mentioned in the commencement of that first preface which formed the groundwork of the preceding lecture. It is there said: "It hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it."

But this "*middle path*",—as must of necessity be the case from its very position,—has ever subjected her to the attacks and vituperations of the two extremes by which she is bordered. On the one extreme, the wild fanaticism of the Puritan,—on the other, the assumed infallibility of the Romanist. It is just as Dean Comber has very strongly observed: "The poor Liturgy suffers from two extremes; —one sort says, *It is old superstitious Roman dotage;* the other, *It is schismatically new.*"

The Puritan, and his descendants of the present day, the modern Dissenters, would say that our usages and forms, our dress and ceremonial, are too much allied to Rome, specially when those usages and ceremonials are carefully attended to and conscientiously observed; while

the Romanist says that we have lost the spirit of antiquity and Catholicism, by our coldness, and the infrequency of our services, by our laxity in discipline, and meagreness in devotion, specially where the real spirit and meaning of our Prayer Book has been forgotten or disused.

Such, however, must naturally be the result of the "*middle path*." But it does not follow that this "middle path" should be the wrong one. We should rather infer the contrary, from the very fact of the two extremes finding fault with the same points of character under different names, viewed as they would be, by each of them, under different aspects,—that which is formalism and superstition to the one, being coldness and want of devotion to the other. In fact, *moderation* is the acknowledged character of our Church; moderation without compromise. Both in the Preface, which was considered in the last sermon, and in that of which I propose to speak now, it is quite remarkable how gentle the language is,—how firm and decided the *arguments*, yet how scrupulous against offence the words. There are no hard names bandied to and fro, —there is no abuse or violence of sectarianism or party spirit, but a gentle setting forth of that which is considered the Catholic truth, without respect of persons. There is no mention made of *Protestant*, as against the Church of Rome, whereby we might be identified with the Reformation on the continent; nor any mention of *Papist* or *Romanist*, whereby we might be thought to separate from the Church Catholic, therein committing ourselves to the peculiar tenets of any party; but there is a mild and conciliatory spirit of remonstrance, without partisanship,—a firm exposure of abuses and corruptions for the sake of amendment, yet without forsaking the spirit of charity, or abandoning the bonds of unity. There breathes throughout no hint or suspicion but that, as the Church of England, we had the right gently yet firmly to take our course of restoration, as a Church equal in descent, if not more than equal, with any, as deriving authority from the Apostles, and having within us the spirit of the Fathers of Christ's Church Universal.

The truth of these observations will be very clear from

a comparison of the Preface which will come under our review in the present sermon, with that which was considered previously. It might appear at first sight that that which stands first in order in the Prayer Book, is first in point of time. But it is not so. In the first Preface we took up the defence of our Church against the various classes of Nonconformists about the time of the Commonwealth,—the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, Brownists,, and the like ; but our present duty takes up a time prior to this, when our Church was in the act of setting herself free from the usurped dominion of the Pope. So that we have a considerable interval of time between the one and the other. The date of the first Preface is 1662, the date of the second is 1549,—the latter belonging to the first English Prayer Book that was published, namely, that commonly called Edward the Sixth's first Book. In the one then we naturally find all its allusions to bear reference to the evils of dissent and schism ; in the other, to those of Romanism. In the one the Church had long been set free from Rome, but in that setting free she had nearly, as it were, overbalanced herself, and was in imminent danger of losing her Catholicity, by the inroads of unbridled latitudinarianism,—in the other, she never dreamed of any danger, save that of the unjust dominion of a foreign bishop, and the superstitious abuses of a corrupt age, which had lost sight of primitive simplicity. Each bears marks of the time, in its language and its object. In each we are reminded of the danger against which our fathers then were struggling ; and happy indeed will it be for us, if still steering our course in this middle path, our holy Church shall abide steadfast and vigilant, taking up the good, and refusing the evil, to which these two Prefaces, in their several ages, refer.

Bearing then in mind that our business now is with the Preface, which is second in order, but first in point of date, let us proceed to consider it in its details. As we go through it, we shall find the following to be the order of the subjects on which we shall have to speak.

First. *The reading of Holy Scripture, as forming an essential portion of Divine Service;* and connected with

this, the abuses of the duty on the part of the Roman Church, and our correction of such abuses.

Secondly. The order of the Prayer Book, so containing Holy Scripture, appointed, *not for weekly or occasional services, but for* DAILY SERVICE. We shall confine our attention to the first of these subjects in the present lecture.

The Preface commences thus:

CONCERNING THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

There was never any thing by the wit of man so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not been corrupted; as, among other things, it may plainly appear by the Common Prayers in the Church, commonly called Divine Service. The first original and ground whereof, if a man would search out by the ancient Fathers, he shall find, that the same was not ordained but of a good purpose, and for a great advancement of godliness. For they so ordered the matter, that all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once every year; intending thereby, that the Clergy, and especially such as were Ministers in the congregation, should (by often reading, and meditation in God's word) be stirred up to godliness themselves, and be more able to exhort others by wholesome doctrine, and to confute them that were adversaries to the truth; and further, that the people, (by daily hearing of holy Scripture read in the Church) might continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true religion.

No one who is at all used to our Liturgy, can fail of observing the very great portion of holy Scripture that is embraced in it. 1. There are the sentences, by which we begin the service. 2. There are the Psalms of David, read through, morning and evening, once a month. 3. There are the Canticles at the termination of each Lesson. 4. There are the two Lessons, by which the Old Testament, with the Apocrypha, is read through once a year, and the New Testament three times a year. 5. There is the Decalogue, rehearsed in the ears of the people at every Communion service, with the sentences at the offertory, and the "comfortable words" at holy Communion. 6. There is the Gospel and Epistle for every Sunday and Holy Day, both fast and festival. So that it may fairly be

said that the greater portion of our service consists in the reading or hearing God's own holy word.*

Now this practice, as our Preface informs us, is founded upon the "*ancient Fathers*"; and it is even prior to the ancient Fathers, for our Lord himself, as we know, "went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias."—*Luke* iv, 17. And we find it also as a Jewish custom, in *Acts* xiii. 15; "They went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and sat down. And after the *reading of the law and the prophets*, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on." From the Jews the custom easily passed on to the Christians, and we find continual mention of it in all those Fathers who speak of the customs of public worship.

In the first century, Justin Martyr, giving an account of the Christians, in his Apology, says thus: "Upon that day of the week which is called Sunday, all that dwell in the city and neighbouring country meet together in a certain specified place, where they read the writings of the Apostles and the ancient prophets in such portions as the time will allow."† S. Jerome says that "they met to-

* We ought also to add the *Litany*, which in its proper place will be shown to contain a great portion of the Psalms of David; and we ought also to observe the same spirit breathing throughout all the occasional services, as well as the mattins and even-song. For instance, in *Holy Baptism* there is constant allusion to Scripture in the prayers; and a Gospel is appointed suitable for the subject, both for infants and adults. In the *Catechism*, or instruction for catechumens, as ordered in the Baptismal service, there is the Lord's Prayer and Ten Commandments. In *Solemnization of Matrimony*, Psalms of David, and Lessons from the Epistles. In the *Visitation of the Sick*, Psalms, Lesson from the Epistles, and Versicles adopted from the Psalms. *Burial of the Dead*, Psalms and Lessons. *Churching of Women*, Psalms and Versicles from the Psalms. *Commination*, a Summary taken from the Book of Deuteronomy, with a Psalm and Versicles, and Prayers with constant Scriptural allusion. And the same may be observed in the *Form of Prayer to be used at Sea*, and also in the *Ordinal*. In short, all through, and in every service, Psalms and Lessons from God's holy word form the staple part of the services, just as in the mattins and even-song.

† Justin. M. Apolog. I. c. 87, p. 131.

gether for divine worship, and then that Psalms are sung and Scriptures are read."* S. Austin describes the mixture of psalmody and Scripture in much the same terms as we might speak of our own Liturgy at this present day. First he speaks of the reading of the Epistle, then of singing the 95th Psalm, and then of a lesson read out of the Gospel.† The Book of the Constitutions also mentions: "First, the reading of the Old Testament, and then the Psalms, and after that the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles, and last of all the Gospels."‡ Cassian also says, describing the customs of the Egyptian monasteries: "They sing twelve Psalms every morning and evening in their solemn meetings, and have two Lessons read, one out of the Old Testament, and the other out of the New, and have prayers between the Psalms."§ S. Basil speaks, in a homily upon baptism, of "Lessons being read besides the Psalms, one out of Isaiah, the second out of the Acts, and the third out of S. Matthew."‖ And lastly we may mention that the Council of Laodicea made a decree specially in regard to the manner of reading the Scripture: "We do not think it convenient that in the congregation the Psalms for the day should be read in order all together, but that the Lessons should be mixed between them."¶

* Hieron. Ep. xxii. ad Eustoch. c. 15.

† Augustin, Serm. x, de Verbis Apostol. p. 112.

‡ Constitut. lib. ii, cap. 57; lib. v, c. 19.

§ Cassian, lib. ii, cap. 2 et 6.

‖ S. Basil, Hom. xiii, de Bapt. tom. i, p. 409.

¶ Concil. Laodic. canon 17. For a full account of this matter, the reader should consult Bingham's Antiquities, book xiv. cap. i, § 2, and chap. iii, § 2.

"In Augustine's time, the Scriptures were constantly read in the religious assemblies of Christians in Africa; some parts of Scripture were by custom read at certain seasons of the year. Of this Augustin speaks in the prologue to his tracts or sermons upon the first epistle of John; and in some of his sermons at the time of Easter, or the week before it. We saw some time ago that the book of the Acts was begun to be read at Easter. They had oftentimes three readings, and, as it seems, in this order: epistles of apostles, a psalm, the gospels; at least that order is several times mentioned at the beginning of Augustine's sermons, which were discourses upon such portions of Scripture as had been before read. Sometimes he discoursed briefly upon each of the readings; at other times he

The principle, then, of reading holy Scripture as a part of divine service, is thus clearly proved to be of ancient origin, and consistent with Catholic custom. We now pass on to see how this custom became abused by the Roman Church, and how its true spirit and intention, as for edification and godliness, was lost by the perversions introduced in later times. For this purpose we must read another portion of the Preface :

> But these many years passed, this godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers hath been so altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories, and legends, with multitudes of responds, verses, vain repetitions, commemorations, and synodals; that commonly when any book of the Bible was begun, after three or four chapters were read out, all the rest were unread. And in this sort the book of Isaiah was begun in Advent, and the book of Genesis in Septuagesima; but they were only begun and never read through ; after like sort were other books of holy Scripture used. And moreover, whereas St. Paul would have such language spoken to the people in the church, as they might understand, and have profit by hearing the same; the service in this Church of England these many years hath been read in Latin to the people, which they understand not; so that they have heard with their ears only, and their heart, spirit, and mind, have not been edified thereby. And furthermore, notwithstanding that the ancient Fathers have divided the Psalms into seven portions, whereof every one was called a Nocturn : now of late time a few of them have been daily said, and the rest utterly omitted. Moreover the number and hardness of the rules called the Pie, and the manifold changings of the service, was the cause, that to turn the book only was so hard and intricate a matter, that many times there was more business to find out what should be read, than to read it when it was found out.

pitched upon one of them only, as a subject of discourse. In the work of *The City of God*, he speaks of the reading the Scriptures as a general thing among Christians. 'In the faithful writings of the Evangelists are recorded both the miracles of Christ, and the doctrine for the confirming of which they were wrought. They were published to produce faith ; and because they were believed, they have been made still more public, for they are read to the public that they may be believed; and if they had not been believed, they would not have been read. The canonical books of Scripture being read everywhere, the miracles therein recorded are well known to all people.' (De Civitate Dei, lib. xxii, c. 8, t. 7.) In the same work he has an excellent article on the benefit of the Christian religion, 'On account of the public reading the Scriptures in the Churches, where

In the above passage two principal reasons are given why the reading of Scripture according to the Roman custom was deficient, and why an alteration was therefore needed, in order to restore it to its original state.

1st. By reason of the introduction of responds, legends, uncertain stories, commemorations, synodals, and the like.

2ndly. By the use of the Latin language, instead of the vernacular tongue.

1. First then, instead of reading the whole chapter from beginning to end, or, at any rate, such complete portions of a chapter as would present to the congregation one definite and complete subject, such as we see was the case from the quotations above made from the ancient Fathers,—instead of this, the Roman Church had adopted a custom of interrupting the course of the chapter by various little interludes, as it were. Their custom was to take three or four verses of a chapter, and then to pause, and make a response; then to recur to the Scripture, and read three or four more verses, which were followed in like manner by a response. After this would succeed the reading of short lessons taken from different uninspired writers, such as S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, S. Augustin, Pope Leo, Gregory, and the like; and these readings were likewise interrupted by responses which occurred at intervals between the passages selected. Then again in the Psalms, antiphons, or anthems, *i. e.* short verses with responses, would continually occur. Also in the course of the service there would be introduced stories or legends of saints and martyrs; commemorations of benefactors of the Church, and sometimes synodals,—that is, the decrees of councils or synods. The term "nocturns" used in the Preface refers to the ancient manner of reading the Psalms. They were divided into seven portions, one for each day of the

was a confluence of all sorts of people, of both sexes; and the best rules of life, with proper arguments, are proposed; and if some attended on these readings, who were not made thoroughly virtuous, the advantage to *many* was very great, and the usefulness of the design was manifest.' (Idem. lib. ii, c. 28.) He observes in a sermon, that the epistles of Paul and Peter were daily read to the people all over the world." Lardner, *Credibility*, p. ii, c. 117.

week. Each portion was called a *Nocturn*. In the times of persecution, the Christians could only meet for divine service in the night: and at this time they principally chanted the Psalms, and celebrated the eucharist. Afterwards, when persecution ceased, they still continued their assemblies in the night, as being a time peculiarly suitable for devotion; and when the Church was firmly established, and the hours of prayer fixed, the *nocturn* was always considered the first hour of meeting, being about three or four o'clock in the morning, before daylight began. These nocturns then seem to have given to the reading of the Psalms their own name, meaning the seventh portion of the Psalms appointed for that day's reading. But it appears that much of this had disappeared at the time of the Reformation, and there was not that regular course of reading which had been the original practice.

Upon the whole, we are enabled easily to perceive how ill-regulated and discordant must have been the method of reading the Scriptures practised by the Roman Church; no definite subject being laid before the congregation at any one time, but all, as it were, a patchwork; no complete chapter, no complete Psalm, but constant interruptions and breaks. We must also add to what has been said, that the order or plan upon which the service was to be conducted, was regulated by a calendar, called in the Preface *The Pie*;* but this order was perplexed

* The "Pie" is a table and rule in the old Roman offices, shewing in a technical way how to find out the service which is to be read on each day, which, consisting of numerous particulars, by the intermixing the several offices, which sometimes fall in together to be read, makes it difficult to be understood. As to the meaning of the name, what was called the "Pie" by the clergy before the Reformation, was called by the Greeks Πινακ (Pinax) the index; for that word signifies metaphorically a painted table or picture, and the indices or tables of books being formed into square figures resembling pictures, or painted tables hung up in a frame, these likewise were called Πινακες (Pinakes), or, being marked only with the first letter of the word πι, "Pies." This was probably the origin of the term. But these tables being made with initial letters of red, and likewise some other remarkable letters or words thereof being of the same colour, it was thought that the table was called "Pie" from the party-coloured letters whereof it did consist; and upon this account wher.

and confused, being affected by the continually-recurring commemorations of saints and martyrs crossing and interfering with the order of the daily service. It was almost impossible for the priest himself to understand how the service was to proceed, and to the congregation the whole of it must have presented a maze of difficulty and confusion. We must again add to what has been said, that the Breviary, as in use at that time, contained in its antiphons or anthems, many objectionable doctrines, specially in regard to the addresses made to the Virgin Mary and other saints. This feature of the Romish Breviary, so strongly marked at the time of the Reformation, is not however to be found in the purer ages of the Roman Church. Gregory VII was the first person who put together a Breviary ;* and in that first Breviary

they put it into Latin they called it "Pica." Thus in former times some of the friars from their party-coloured habits were called "Pies" Afterwards, when printing came into use, these letters, which were of a moderate size, not so big as the large text hand in the manuscripts, but were of the bigness only of those in the comments and tables, were called "Pica" letters.—*Nicholls' Comment on the Book of Common Prayer.*

* It seems that the word "Breviary" is one of modern introduction, first occurring about the eleventh century. It has been observed higher up that there were formerly in use several distinct books containing the services of the Church, the Hymnarium, Psalterium, Homilarium, and the like. It was Gregory VII who put these offices together, and extracting from the several other books a *short compendium* for the services of each day, gave perhaps the first idea of a *Breviary.* Some have said that the Breviary was at first nothing more than a collection of the Rubrics which directed the service, and not the service itself. "Breviarum dictum est quasi breveorarium, sive precum epitome." Grancolas Comment. Histor. in Roman. Breviar. 4to. Ven. 1734. That which before directed the daily service went under several names. such as "Horæ Canonicæ," "Divinum Officium," "Cursus Dei." The corruptions and additions continued from year to year to increase, especially the addition of Legends, until the Breviary is no longer the short compendium which it was intended to be, but, on the contrary, a very large volume. There had been several attempts to reform and purify it even by the Romanists themselves, Cardinal Quignon especially. Many of the most objectionable portions of the book were put out by Quignon, and an amended edition was published A.D. 1536. It was not, however, universally adopted, but the Franciscan Breviary was selected in its place, and appointed by Pope Pius V as the authorized form. The quotations in this work are from the edition of MDCXXX.

there is no mention of addresses to the saints. No "Ave Maria," or "Salve Regina," or "Alma Redemptoris," was there:—those hymns which afterwards deformed and to this day so much disfigure the Romish service-book. We must always remember that it was not until the thirteenth century that these objectionable hymns were introduced. From that time until the sixteenth century, the abuses in the Breviary had gradually crept on; but in the time of Gregory VII the book was comparatively pure. At first we may imagine that the introduction of foreign and uninspired matter, such as lessons from Gregory, Chrysostom, and the like, coupled with antiphons and hymns, led the way to abuse as *additions;* and then as by these additions the service became too long, resort was had to the shortening and curtailing the scriptural part. We may easily trace the basis of the form, in the ancient practice of reading psalms and lessons alternately; but the Romish service, as in the more corrupt ages, differed from the ancient, in shortening whole chapters into three or four verses, and preferring S. Chrysostom and S. Ambrose to the pure word of God.

To make what has been said intelligible, I shall now add a portion of the Romish service for the first Sunday in Advent, translated from the Latin. The Scripture reading begins from the first chapter of Isaiah, just as it is found in our own Calendar, but it is treated thus:—

First Sunday in Advent.

The book of the prophet Isaiah begins:

Lesson I.

"The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, which he saw, &c." Continuing to the end of the *third verse*, at the end of which is said, "But Thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us."

Response—"Thanks be to God."

Then the Response continues—

"Looking afar, behold I see the power of God coming, and a cloud covering the whole earth. Go ye forth to

meet Him, and say, Tell us whether Thou be He who shall rule over His people Israel.

"All ye children of the earth and sons of men, rich and poor together, go ye forth to meet Him, and say, Tell us whether Thou be He that shall rule over His people Israel.

"Hear, O Thou Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a sheep.

"Tell us whether thou be He who shall rule over His people Israel.

"Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the king of glory shall come in.

"Who shall rule over His people Israel.

"Glory be to the Father, &c.

"Looking afar off, behold I see," &c.

After this Response is ended, we come to

Lesson II.

"Ah! sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity," &c. [Three more verses of the Prophet Isaiah].

At the end of the three verses, the second *Response*.

"I saw in the visions of the night, and behold one like unto the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him.

"His dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not be taken away, and His kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

"That all people, nations, and languages," &c.

Then follows

THE BENEDICTION.

"Let the grace of the Holy Spirit illuminate our hearts and senses."

After this Response and Bendiction.

Lesson III.

"Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire," &c. [Three more verses of the Prophet Isaiah].

When this third lesson is ended, the third *Response* as follows:

"The angel Gabriel was sent to Mary, a virgin espoused to Joseph, announcing to her the word, and the virgin was troubled at the sight. Fear not, Mary, thou hast found favour with the Lord, and behold thou shalt conceive and bring forth a Son, and He shall be called the Son of the Highest.

"The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David, and he shall rule over the house of Jacob for ever.

"Behold thou shalt conceive, and bring forth a son, &c.

"Glory to the Father, and to the Son, &c.

"Behold thou shalt conceive, and bring forth a son," &c.

After this we hear no more of the first chapter of Isaiah, but the service continues in the second Nocturn with a lesson taken from S. Leo the Pope, thus:

Lesson IV.

SERMON OF S. LEO, POPE.

"Our Saviour, in His account of the coming of the kingdom of God, and of the end of the world, addressed to His Apostles, and in them to the whole Church, bids them beware, lest at any time their hearts should be weighed down with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life; which warning, beloved brethren, we know to belong to us specially; to whom the threatened day, though hidden, is certainly near."

Then follows the fourth *Response*.

"Hail! thou that art highly favoured. The Lord is with thee. The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee, therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.

"How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And the angel answered, and said to her—

"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee," &c.

Then follows

Lesson V.

"At whose coming it is fitting that all mankind should

be prepared, lest it should surprise any in gluttony or worldly cares," &c. So continuing a short passage from S. Leo.

Then the fifth *Response*.

"We look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change this vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto His glorious body.

"Let us live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world, looking for the blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God.

"Who shall change this vile body," &c.

Then follows

Lesson VI.

Another passage continued from S. Leo, and this followed by the sixth *Response*.

"O my Lord, send, I pray Thee, by the hand of Him whom Thou wilt send. Behold the affliction of Thy people. As Thou hast spoken, come and deliver us.

"Hear, O Thou Shepherd of Israel. Thou that leadest Joseph like a sheep; Thou that sittest between the Cherubims.

"As Thou hast spoken, come and deliver us.

"Glory be to the Father, &c.

"And deliver us."

Then follows

Lesson VII.

"There shall be signs in the sun and in the moon, and in the stars," &c.—*S. Luke* xxi. 25. Continuing to the thirty-third verse, which is continued by a homily from Pope Gregory, thus:

"Our Lord and Redeemer desirous of finding us ready, foretells what evils will attend the world as it grows old, in order to restrain us from the love of it. He makes known what great blows shall precede its approaching end; that if we will not fear God in prosperity, at least when afflicted by His blows, we may dread His judgments."

Then the seventh *Response*.

"Behold a Virgin shall conceive and bear a son, saith

the Lord, and his name shall be called Wonderful—the mighty God.

"Upon the throne of David, and over his kingdom, shall he reign for ever.

"And his name shall be called," &c.

Then,—

Lesson VIII.

(Continued from Pope Gregory).

"Shortly before the passage of the Holy Gospel, which my brethren have been hearing, the Lord had said, 'Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and great earthquakes shall be in divers places, and pestilences and famines.' And after some additions, he added what you have just heard—'There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon,' &c. Of which we see some already fulfilled, and others we fear as soon coming."

Then the eighth *Response.*

"Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it to the ends of the earth, and say to the isles afar off, Our Saviour shall come.

"Declare it, and make it heard; speak, and cry out, and say to the isles," &c. Then,—

Lesson IX.

(Continued again from Gregory).

"For we perceive that nation is rising against nation, and they press upon the earth more in our times than we read in books. You know how frequently we hear from other parts of the world of earthquakes overwhelming cities. We suffer pestilences without ceasing. We do not yet openly behold signs in the sun, moon, and stars, but from the change in the air, we know that they are not far off."

Then the ninth *Response.*

"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up unto David a righteous branch, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice on the earth, and this is His name whereby He shall be called—'The Lord our Righteousness.'

"In His days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely.

"And this is His name, whereby He shall be called, &c.

"Glory be to the Father, &c.

"The Lord our Righteousness."

With this ninth lesson and Response, the Matin service terminates.

I have now laid before you the whole of a Sunday Matin service, as it occurs in the Breviary; and by this it will easily be perceived what is meant in the Preface by the breaking up and neglecting of Scripture, and how these continued Responses and repetitions, affect the meaning and impressiveness of the whole. I shall now add one or two of the Antiphons or Anthems.

Antiphon to the Blessed Virgin.

(*Used from Advent to the Purification.*)

"Kind Mother of the Redeemer, who art the ever open gate of heaven, and the star of the sea, help a fallen people which is trying to rise. Thou who didst give birth to thy Creator, nature marvelling, a Virgin both before and after, receiving the salutation from the mouth of Gabriel, be merciful towards sinners."

Another.

(*Used from the Purification to Good Friday.*)

"Hail! O Queen of the heavens;
Hail! Lady of angels.
Hail the root, hail the gate,
From whom to the world light rises.
Rejoice, O glorious Virgin,
Beautiful above all;
Farewell, O thou very beautiful,
And prevail on Christ for us by Thy prayer."

ANOTHER.

(*Used from Easter to Trinity.*)

"Rejoice, O Queen of heaven, Hallelujah,
For He, whom for thy obedience' sake, thou didst bear, Hallelujah,
Is risen as He said. Hallelujah,
Pray Thou to God for us." Hallelujah.

ANOTHER.

(*Used from Trinity to Advent.*)

"Hail, Queen, mother of mercy; our life, and sweetness, and hope, hail. To thee we exiles cry out, the sons of Eve; to thee we sigh, groaning and weeping, in this valley of tears. Come, then, O our patroness; turn thou on us those merciful eyes of thine, and shew to us, after this exile, Jesus, the blessed fruit of thy womb, O gracious, O pitiful, O sweet Virgin Mary."

Let us now take a specimen of *Legends:*

On the 12th of June we find a festival appointed to celebrate the memory of Basilides, Cyrenius, Nabor, and Nazarius, martyrs; and on that day the lessons are as follow:

Lesson II.

"Basilides, Cyrenius, Nabor, and Nazarius, Roman soldiers, noble by birth, and illustrious by valour, having embraced the Christian religion, and when under Diocletian the emperor, they had proclaimed Christ to be the Son of God, were seized by Aurelius, the prefect of the city, and commanded to offer sacrifice to the gods. They despised his commands, and were sent to prison. In answer to their prayers, a most beautiful light appeared to the eyes of all who were in the place, and lighted up the prison. By that heavenly splendour, Marcellus, prefect of the guard, was moved, and many others, and believed in Christ the Lord."

Lesson III.

"But after they had been delivered from the prison by the emperor Maximian, and when, in neglect of his command, they were ever speaking of the one God and Lord Christ, having been put to the torture they were again cast into prison, from whence being brought out on the seventh day, and placed before the emperor, they persisted in their derision of the vain gods of the Heathen, with the greatest constancy confessing Christ to be God. Wherefore being condemned, they were scourged, and their bodies being thrown to wild beasts, and not touched by them, they were honourably buried by the Christians."

On the 19th of September we find the feast of S. Januarius, and the legend appointed for the lesson is as follows:

Lesson IV.

"Januarius, bishop of Beneventum, in the persecution of Diocletian and Maximian against the Christians, is brought to Nola before Timotheus, prefect of Campania, on account of his profession of the Christian faith. There his constancy being variously tried, he was cast into a burning furnace and came out unhurt, so much so that the fire neither injured his clothes nor his hair. At this the prefect, being inflamed with anger, commands the body of the martyr to be stretched apart to such a degree that the joints and limbs are loosened. In the meantime, Festus, his deacon, and Desiderius, the reader, being taken, are bound together with the bishop, and carried to Puteoli. There they are thrown into the same prison with", &c. [Mentioning other subjects of martyrdom.]

Lesson V.

"The day after, all were thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre, but the beasts, forgetful of their natural fierceness, cast themselves before the feet of Januarius. Timotheus, attributing this to magic incantations, when he had pronounced sentence of death against the Christian martyrs, suddenly became blind; but at the prayers of the

blessed Januarius, he received his sight again, at which miracle nearly a thousand men embraced the faith of Christ. But the ungrateful judge was not by any means rendered more placable by this benefit, but infuriated by the conversion of such a multitude, commanded the bishop with his companions to be put to the sword."

Lesson VI.

"The neighbouring cities, as each was desirous of adopting a patron before God, took charge of their bodies for the purpose of burial. The Neapolitans, by the divine command, took the body of Januarius, which being brought first to Beneventum and thence to the monastery of the Virgin, afterwards was carried to Naples, and being buried in the Church, was celebrated for many miracles. But this was principally memorable; that when globes of fire burst forth from Mount Vesuvius, bringing the terror of destruction not only on the neighbouring cities but also on those at a distance, the body of the martyr extinguished these globes of fire. This also is very notorious: that his blood, which being hardened, is preserved in a glass bottle, when it is placed in the sight of the martyr's body, is perceived to this day in a wonderful manner to melt and bubble up, just as if it had been recently shed."*

Sufficient has now been said to exemplify and explain the observations made in the Preface on the subject of reading the Holy Scriptures. The justification of our Reformers in clearing away so much objectionable matter, and restoring the service book to something like the simplicity of the ancient fathers, is surely quite made out.

* Of legends similar to the above, incorporated in the services, and made parts of the day's devotion, the Romish calendar is full. Sometimes two occur on the same day, which is then called a double commemoration. The following is the number in each month of such legendary days. I, of course, exempt the days which are observed with services in our own Prayer-Book. These days having all reference to *Scripture* saints, are furnished with *Scripture* lessons, and do not depend on the legendary spirit of the days above described. The following is the number of the days: in January, 19; February, 11; March, 12; April, 14; May, 18; June, 15; July, 22; August, 23; September, 19; October, 16; November, 18; December, 12.

We shall now heartily join with them in what they say in their own defence, in the following passage :—

> These inconveniences therefore considered, here is set forth such an order, whereby the same shall be redressed. And for a readiness in this matter, here is drawn out a Calendar for that purpose, which is plain and easy to be understood; wherein (so much as may be) the reading of holy Scripture is so set forth, that all things shall be done in order, without breaking one piece from another. For this cause be cut off Anthems, Responds, Invitatories, and such like things as did break the continual course of the reading of the Scripture.
>
> Yet, because there is no remedy, but that of necessity there must be some Rules; therefore certain Rules are here set forth; which, as they are few in number, so they are plain and easy to be understood. So that here you have an Order for Prayer, and for the reading of the holy Scripture, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers, and a great deal more profitable and commodious, than that which of late was used. It is more profitable, because here are left out many things, whereof some are untrue, some uncertain, some vain and superstitious; and nothing is ordained to be read, but the very pure word of God, the holy Scriptures, or that which is agreeable to the same; and that in such a language and order as is most easy and plain for the understanding both of the readers and hearers. It is also more commodious, both for the shortness thereof, and for the plainness of the order, and for that the rules be few and easy.

II. But there was another subject mentioned in the Preface, to which we must allude before the conclusion of this lecture—a subject in some degree connected with the above, as affecting the edification of the people, but still distinct. It regards *the language in which Divine service is to be performed.*

If the intermixing of lessons from holy Scripture with legends and the like, as above described, was contrary to Catholic custom, what shall we have to say on the subject of the introduction of the Latin tongue as the vehicle by which not only the lessons were delivered *to* the people, but also all the prayers were offered *for* the people of God? It must be well known to most persons that the Romish service books are still in the Latin language, and though improvements have been made of late in some of the private devotional books, by printing the Latin on one side, and the English on the other, still the words offered up to

God in public are in the Latin tongue,—a tongue understood by very few even of the higher orders as a language of conversation, and by the poor not understood at all. It is evident to common sense that, pretending to join in prayer with sounds, not words, must be a blasphemy; that hearing lessons of Scripture, which are meant for edification, in a language not understood, must be a breach of common sense, and the whole service must become to the general mass of people a piece of solemn mockery. Nor, indeed, can it be seen on what ground the reading of God's word in *Latin* can be maintained as preferable to *Greek* or *Hebrew*. If it were said,—"We must read the Scriptures in their original language, and we do not permit the vernacular tongue to be used, because it is inadequate as a translation to convey the meaning of God's word,"—we might, indeed, see some force in such an observation. But if the Scriptures are translated at all, why should they not be translated into one language as well as into another? Why should the *Latin* be selected in preference to others? It is, indeed, in strict consistency with that thirst for universal dominion, by which the Church of Rome has ever been beset. As she was the queen of nations, and the centre of temporal dominion for many years, so she would be the queen of Churches, and the centre of spiritual dominion over all the earth for ever; as she must have one universal bishop, so she must have one universal language.*

* The warmth and indignation with which Bingham speaks of this is very observable, being so contrary to his usual quiet manner of writing:—"There is nothing more certain in history than that the service of the ancient Church was always performed in the vulgar, or common language of every country; that is, such as was either commonly spoken, or, at least, commonly understood. And so it continued for above a thousand years in the Church. And it is even monstrous to think that in so inquisitive an age as the present is, there should be any men of learning to defend, or whole nations so tamely to submit to the imposition and tyranny of the contrary practice, so absurd and unreasonable in itself, so prejudicial to devotion, so contrary to the use of speech, whose end is edification; so reproachful to human nature, as if men were asses, indeed, (as Thomas Aquinas once made the comparison), so derogatory to the Christian's birthright, so flatly contradictory to the Apostle's reasoning, and so diametrically opposite to the universal practice of the Church for so many ages."—*Bingham's Antiquities*, bk. xiii, c. 4.

It may be presumed that the idea which the Church of Rome would proclaim at the present day, by still persisting in the use of the Latin tongue, is this: that as there is uniformity of prayer, and uniformity of doctrine, so there should be uniformity of language. There is, indeed, a notion of Catholicity in this, which to some minds may appear grateful. It may be grateful to think that all the world, on the same days, and at the same times, is pouring forth the same prayers to Almighty God, and hearing His word in the same language. But this can only be in the imagination. It cannot be really true that all the world is so doing, unless it be true that all the world is of one *mind* in language. For what is prayer? If prayer be mere sound: if prayer be only the voice of one or two priests with their attendants, muttering sounds in which the people can take no part, then it would seem that the language of the service were a matter of indifference. But it will surely be allowed that prayer has reference to the worshipper, as well as to Him who is worshipped, and to the *mind* of the worshipper as well as to his *ear*. That cannot be really prayer universal, which is only intelligible to one or two out of thousands; and so there is no Catholicity in it after all. It is an apparent, external agreement merely, without any real harmony within.

It would seem also a sort of presumption on the part of man to endeavour to restore that universality of language which God, at two several manifestations of His power, has signified should not exist among the nations of the world. By the confusion of tongues at Babel, God's will was expressed that men should not use one language; and by the miracle of the gift of tongues at Pentecost, God's will was again manifested that in the Christian dispensation diversity of language should still continue. If it had been otherwise; if, on the introduction of the Church of Christ, as by that miracle established, it had been God's will that we should worship Him in one tongue, then the effect of the miracle would doubtless have been the destruction of the different languages then existing, and the return of mankind to one. But it was the reverse: for the miracle gave facility and power to the Apostles to speak in *different*

tongues. It expressly contemplated a multiplicity of languages, in which God's word was to be made known: and the gift of the Spirit was, expressly, to spread the glad tidings of salvation in every language under heaven. The expression of the wondering multitude of "Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judæa and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, strangers of Rome, Jews, and Proselytes, Cretes, and Arabians"—the expression of the whole multitude was this: "How hear we every man *in our own tongue wherein we were born.*"

But, independently of this, let us examine the practice of the ancient Church; for on this point will mainly turn all questions of Liturgical observance. In doing so, we find the united testimony of antiquity in favour of Divine service being performed in the language of each particular people. S. Basil says: "Thou hast the psalms, thou hast the prophets, the precepts of the Gospel, the preachings of the Apostles. Let thy tongue sing, and thy mind search the meaning of what is spoken, that thou mayest sing with the spirit, and sing with the understanding also." In another place he alludes to S. Paul, and says, "How can a man pray with the Spirit, while his mind is unfruitful?" and he answers, that it refers to praying in a tongue unknown to the hearers, "for the Apostle says, 'If I pray in an unknown tongue, my spirit indeed prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful;'* for when the words of a prayer are not known to them that are present, the understanding of him that prayeth is unfruitful, because his prayer is of no use or advantage."† Origen also says,—"The Grecians use the Greek language in their prayers, and the Romans the Roman, and so every one in his own dialect prays to God, and gives thanks as he is able."‡ Many passages of a similar kind are found throughout the

* The reader should refer to the whole of S. Paul's argument in 1 Cor. xiv.

† Basil. in Ps. xxviii, serm. i, t. 2, p. 154; et Ps. lix, p. 253, quoted by Bingham, to whom refer, book xiii, c. iv.

‡ Origen contra Celsum, lib. viii, p. 402.

writings of the Fathers, all alluding to the Scriptures, the psalms, and the service, as *understood* by the laity, which they could not have been, had they been in an unknown tongue. We may add to this that the ancient Church appointed an order of *interpreters*, similar to those of whom we read in the Jewish dispensation; and the office of the interpreter was expressly to translate for the people what was said, whenever it happened that by any accident the reader of Scripture was of a different country or language from that of the congregation, —which in those early times was sometimes the case. It is probably to this that S. Paul alludes in the epistle to the Corinthians; where he strongly puts it, as though in every case the people were to be made acquainted with the meaning of what was said:—"I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied, for greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he *interpret*, that the Church may receive edifying."—1 Cor. xiv. 5. Again, the book of the *Constitutions* gives us the form of ordination by which the readers were appointed, clearly denoting that they were to speak either in a known tongue, or to have interpreters, and refers to Esdras—"They read in the Book in the Law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to *understand the reading*."—Nehem. viii. 8.

But, happily, we have further evidence still. We can appeal to councils; we need not depend on these chance passages only; we can find in the fourth council of Lateran an express decree, by which prayers are appointed to be used in the common tongue. The council of Trent does, indeed, decree otherwise, at least it speaks as though it were better that service should not be celebrated in the common tongue; but, even by the council of Trent, it is remarkable that the use of the Latin language is not made imperative. The words of that council, which commenced its sessions A.D. 1545, are as follow: "Although the mass contains much instruction for the faithful people, yet it does not seem good to the fathers that it should be everywhere celebrated in the common tongue;"* while the canon in a

* Concil. Trident. cap. viii.

similar way asserts—"If any shall say that mass ought *only* to be celebrated in the common tongue, let him be accursed."* The words are very cautious, and in neither case assert that it is compulsory to use the Latin language. They appear merely to assert that it *may* be used, and that it is *right* that it should be used. But be this as it may, what we have now to do with is the *practice* of the Roman Church, and that practice is to forbid the vernacular tongue, though such practice is in direct opposition to one of its own previous decrees. The fourth council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, in the ninth canon, says as follows: "Because in most parts there are within the same diocese, people of different languages mixed together, having under one faith various rites and customs, we distinctly charge that the bishops of these states or dioceses provide proper persons to celebrate the divine offices, and administer the sacraments of the Church, according to the difference of rites and languages, instructing them both by word and example."† So that here, as in all other matters, the more we investigate the customs of antiquity, the more we find the Church of Rome to have departed from the primitive practice; nay, the more we find she has departed from herself in her better ages. Reason, and Scripture, and universal custom, as shewn by the ancient fathers, all testify to the Church of England as right, and the Church of Rome as wrong, in the language of their public prayers and services.

As this Lecture has been necessarily very long, I shall now conclude by merely quoting the fourteenth article of our Church‡—"It is a thing plainly repugnant to the

* Id. Can. ix, Sess. xxii.

† Conc. Lateranense iv, Can. ix, Labbe et Cossart, tom. vii, p. 27.

‡ In the Articles of Edward VI the words were far less decidedly shaped. It was then merely stated thus:

"It is most fit and most agreeable to the word of God, that nothing be read or rehearsed in the congregation in a tongue not known unto the people, which S. Paul hath forbidden to be done, unless some be present to interpret."

But in the present Article the practice is said to be "*repugnant to the word of God.*"

We may as well notice here a paragraph which occurs shortly

word of God, and the custom of the primitive Church, to have public prayer in the Church, or to minister the sacraments in a tongue not understanded of the people."

after the Preface, and necessarily belongs to that portion of it which we have been considering in the present Lecture :

"Though it be appointed that all things shall be read and sung in the Church in the English tongue, to the end that the congregation may be thereby edified, yet it is not meant but that when men say morning or evening prayer privately, they may say the same in any language that they themselves do understand."

On this principle, it may be presumed, it is, that the Bishop of London gives his sanction and license to the saying of morning and evening prayer in the French language, for the benefit of such natives of France resident in London as may be of our communion. And on the same ground it probably is, that in the cathedral of Christ Church, Oxford, the college prayers, morning and evening, are to this day said in Latin,—the only place, I believe, where Latin prayers continue to be used.

SERMON V.

THE DAILY SERVICE.

Acts iii, 1.

"*Now Peter and John went up together into the Temple, at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour.*"

A BELIEF in God being once established in the mind, and that belief extending, as it must inevitably do, in a Christian, to the notion of a superintending and special Providence in that God,—worship and prayer are duties necessarily consequent. Of this we spoke in the first Sermon, as a point not denied by any. But there is a further step. *When*, *how often*, and *where*, are we to pray? Does God care for man, or provide for man, only at long intervals of time, such as years, or months, or weeks? Is time marked out for us by the revolution of the earth round the sun in three hundred and sixty-five days, and by that alone?—or is it marked out with greater impressiveness upon our senses by the revolution of the earth upon its own axis, once every day? Nature seems to say, that as the wants of the body are daily, so our calls upon the providence of God should be daily; and revelation would also say, that as our sins, our sorrows, and our infirmities are daily, so our worship should be daily, whereby we may ask of God help and protection. We must indeed distinguish between *festival* days and ordinary days. Festival days, or days of commemoration, are of especial appointment by the Church, as records of great Christian events, or great Christian men; but they are not of such continual stream and ever-present recurrence, as the changing light and darkness of

every twenty-four hours. Our bodies feel hunger and cold daily. Our senses perceive light and darkness daily. Daily we resort to food, and shelter, and rest, and labour. Daily, therefore, would even nature say, should be our resort to the Throne of Grace.

I put this duty of daily worship, in the first instance, on the ground of reason or nature, because we can see it practised as a duty by those to whom Revelation has never yet come. The Mahomedan, the Hindoo, the Egyptian, the Turk,—the heathen of every class,—is found to worship and pray daily to the Being whom he recognizes as God. The Egyptian worships God three times a day, the Mahomedan five times, and on Fridays six times;—upon which Bishop Beveridge says: "The Turks shall rise up in judgement with this generation, for when their priests call the people to prayer, as they do several times every day, they immediately run to their mosques and temples; and if any offers to stay at home, he is shunned by all, as a wicked atheistical wretch."

But if we go on from nature to God's revealed word,—there too, as we should expect, is the same duty ever set before us. Let us take the Church of the Israelites. Let us also take the Greek and Roman Churches. Among all the deficiencies and errors which we may reluctantly confess in them, still in this there has never been any deviation—their habit was and is to worship God in their temples and their churches *day by day*. And surely if it be so with the heathen,—if it be so with the Jew, possessing but an inferior revelation to that of Christ,—if it be so with the Romanist, notwithstanding his many corruptions,—it may be taken as a mark of universal religion; and the people who are, as a people, deficient in it, must be a people grievously falling short, both in the duties and the privileges of that revelation of which by God's grace they are the recipients. Bishop Butler, than whom no one could be found more eminent for close reasoning, or more acutely sensitive of the truths of our holy faith, compares our scanty worship of God with that of other nations, with this view, and he says: "The Mohamedans are obliged to short devotions five times between morning and evening. In

Roman Catholic countries, people cannot pass a day without having religion recalled to their thoughts, by some or other memorial of it; by some ceremony, or public religious form, occurring in their way; besides their frequent holy-days, the short prayers they are daily called to, and the occasional devotions enjoined by confessors. By these means their superstition sinks deep into the minds of the people, and their religion also, into the minds of such among them as are serious and well-disposed."

We need not follow the *superstition* of the Romanist, but we may imitate his example in devotion of heart and spirit to the service of God. We may take what is good out of what is erroneous, as we may, with shame, even from the heathen; we may take their continual habit of a daily public worship of God, as a principle of religion generally recognized, and fearlessly say, that as a country and a church, compared with other countries and other churches, our deficiency in this principle has been, and is, a grievous sin before the eyes of God.

But it will be well that we ascertain more closely from Holy Scripture and the history of the Church, what has been the will of God in this matter; and for this purpose let us first trace from the Old Testament what has been determined in the Jewish religion,—then let us advert to the Apostles and early Christians,—and afterwards conclude by referring to our own Book of Common Prayer.

It was the custom of the Jews privately to offer prayers to God three times a day,—at morning, noon, and evening. This we find in the case of David, for he says in the fifty-fifth Psalm: "In the evening, morning, and at noon-day, will I pray, and that instantly, and He shall hear my voice." And when the king's decree went forth that no one was to ask a petition save of the king himself for three days, it is said of Daniel (vi. 10): "Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber towards Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God as aforetime." So much for the duty of private prayer. The times of public prayer appear to have corresponded with the times

of the morning and evening sacrifice of the Temple; for we must remember that, before the captivity, there were no synagogues among the Jews, and consequently no forms of public prayer. But the Temple worship was the guide of all other worship; and this accounts for the expression which we meet with, of "*worshipping towards thy holy Temple.*" It seems to have been the custom of the Jews to meet together in the Temple, at the time of sacrifice, and though they had not any common form, they still assembled together; and while the priest before the altar was offering the sacrifice, each one privately, as best he might, would pray. In this light we must understand what is said of the Publican and Pharisee. They went up into the Temple to pray, and each one gave his own prayer. And in this way we understand what is said of Zacharias in the gospel of S. Luke. While Zacharias was gone into the Temple to burn the incense, "*the whole multitude of the people were praying without.*" They probably had assembled there at the hour of sacrifice to perform their daily worship. Afterwards, when synagogues were built, and the people assembled therein, we find that the days of prayer were three days in the week, in addition to fasts and festivals; and they assembled three times on each of those days. But though the synagogue service was only three days in the week, still the private service, corresponding with that of the Temple, was always every day. In fact the daily morning and evening sacrifice of the Temple, according to the Levitical law, displays the will of God as to a daily religious record of His mercies. Sacrifice was a type of prayer. The Temple was a type of the Church. If God, as He did, most strictly enforced the daily sacrifice of the Jew, we may clearly infer His will, as to the spiritual sacrifice of the Christian.*

* Dean Prideaux, in comparing the service of the synagogue with the service of the Temple, as to its daily character, observes as follows:

"As the synagogue service was to be on three days every week for the sake of their hearing the law, so it was to be thrice on those days, for the sake of their prayers. For it was a constant rule among them that all were to pray unto God three times every day,—that is, in the morning, at the time of the morning sacrifice; and in the evening, at

But further, let us observe carefully how the Apostles acted in that peculiar portion of the Church's history in which they were in a state of transition from the one covenant into the other;—when not having ceased to be Jews, they had yet become disciples of Christ. The first account we have is of S. Peter, on the day of Pentecost. In his sermon he converts three thousand souls. The Scripture describes their baptism; their coming out from Judaism; their separation from the world; and their parting with their goods for the general service of the Church; and then it is added, as describing their habits of devotion, "And they continuing *daily with one accord in the Temple*, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart,

the time of the evening sacrifice; and at the beginning of the night, because till then the evening sacrifice was still left burning on the altar.....And it being well understood among the Jews that the offering up of the daily sacrifice and the burning of incense upon the altar of incense at the time of those sacrifices, was for the rendering of God propitious unto them, and making their prayers acceptable in His presence, they were very careful to make the times of their prayers, both at the Temple and everywhere else, to be exactly the same. And therefore as soon as synagogues were erected among them, the hours of public devotion in them on their synagogue days were, as to morning and evening prayer, the same hours in which the morning and evening sacrifices were offered in the Temple."—*Prideaux, Connection*, part i, book vi.

Again, we find in Lightfoot's works: "The two times of worshipping God among the Jews were morning and evening, and that by God's own appointment, the morning and evening sacrifice drawing the people together for that purpose. 'Thou shalt offer upon the altar two lambs of the first year; the one lamb thou shalt offer in the morning, and the other in the evening.' (*Exod.* xxix, 32.) Which precept was constantly observed, so long as the city and polity of the Jews stood. For Josephus says: 'Twice a day, in the morning and the ninth hour, they offer sacrifice.' (*Joseph. Ant.* lib. xiv, c. 4.) And that this was the hour of prayer, for devout people to go to the Temple, to perform their devotions, is plain from *Acts* iii, 1. Peter and John went up together into the Temple, being the ninth hour; which is confirmed by the Talmud. R. Jose Ben Chaninah saith: 'The patriarchs appointed the prayers.' R. Josua Ben Levi saith: 'They appointed them according to the daily sacrifices.' Morning prayer is still the fourth hour; and the prayer of the Mincha, or the evening, is still the evening."—*Beracoth*, cited by Dr. Lightfoot, *Talmud*, Ex. p. 609.

praising God." In this description we find four things worthy of note. First, the periodical character of their devotion—DAILY. Secondly, the manner of their devotion—"*with one accord.*" Thirdly, the place in which they met—"*the Temple.*" Fourthly, the Christianity of their worship, consisting in the holy Eucharistic feast, "*breaking of bread.*" This occurs in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. In the very beginning of the next chapter, we find again: "Now Peter and John went up together into the Temple at the hour of prayer, being the ninth hour." In this we find some additional particulars, all corroborative of what preceded. First, we find that Peter and John went up "*together.*" It was joint prayer; they went to pray at the same time, and in union. Many others also were there, for the lame man upon whom they wrought the miracle there described, is said to have been laid at the gate, for the purpose of asking alms "*of them that entered into the Temple.*" Secondly, as before, it was a holy and public place in which they met, and not a private room: "They went together into the *Temple.*" Their prayers were considered as sanctified and, in a peculiar manner, made holy and acceptable to God, by reason of the *place.* And though indeed prayer is not to be confined to God's house, for it is a duty everywhere,—witness our Lord on the mountain and in the desert,—still it is made peculiar, it is exalted above all other sorts of prayer, when offered in the especial presence of God,—the place wherein He dwells,—where holy angels stand around and join invisibly in man's worship,—where Jesus himself has promised to be, when two or three are gathered together in His name. And thirdly, you will observe that the *hour* of prayer is here mentioned: "*the ninth hour.*" In the second chapter of the Acts we find the "*third hour*" mentioned, and now we find the ninth hour; and these, as known hours of prayer—hours recognized by all the Jewish people, and now on the conversion of those Jews to the discipleship of Christ, still continued to be recognized and practised.

Let us follow this up by the account of S. Peter's imprisonment, in the twelfth chapter of the Acts. It is there

said: "Prayer was made without ceasing of the Church unto God for him"—not once, as of accident, but "*without ceasing*"—not of one, or of families, but "*of the Church*"; and the same observation will apply to the occupation of the disciples, when the Apostle was delivered from prison: "He came to the house of Mary, the mother of John, where *many were gathered together, praying.*" At this time the Christians, being persecuted by the Jews, could not meet together as before in the Temple; therefore, their meetings were in secret, and in a house; but still there was the principle both of joint and of continual prayer. Then consider these texts, bearing in mind that all were addressed to the Church as a *Church*, and not to individuals: "Continue in prayer, and watch in the same with thanksgiving." (*Coloss.* iv. 2). "Pray without ceasing." (1 *Thess.* v, 17.) "I exhort therefore, *first of all*, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and all that are in authority," &c. (1 *Tim.* ii, 1.) And in *Heb.* x, 25: "Not forsaking *the assembling of ourselves together*, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." All these passages, and many more which might be cited, picture to us a Church distinctively marked by PRAYER, and that not occcasional, not once a week, not private only, but prayer upon a system, and public. The Apostles and their disciples were men of prayer. They sought the Lord daily where he might be found; and in the midst of persecution, sorrow, and death, they still "ate their bread with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God *daily*."

We must now pursue the history of the Church in times subsequent to Holy Scripture; and here, for the first two or three centuries, it must be confessed that we do not find any authority by which we can speak of daily meetings for prayer, as regularly established. But upon a very little consideration, the reason of this will be obvious. Nearly the whole of the three first centuries were passed in persecution. The Christians were not permitted to meet openly, even on the Lord's day; and if indeed once a week, it was only by stealth and in secret that they

could meet. Of course it follows that to have any systematic and public meeting for a daily service would have been impossible. We do, however, find that Wednesdays and Fridays were set apart, as being days of prayer; and that very early, Saturday, or the Sabbath, was specially observed, as also the forty days of Lent, and the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost. The festivals of martyrs were also established, with vigils appointed for each, at which the people would meet in the night for watching and prayer; but still we do not find any certain authority for a daily worship, such as afterwards prevailed. But the times of persecution at length passed away; and no sooner was the Church suffered to make her own laws, and without fear to make profession of faith before the world, than a daily system of public worship immediately commenced. From all that can be gathered from ancient writers, it appears that at first the daily service was confined to the morning and the evening,—that is, twice a day. The Book of Constitutions, as cited by Bingham, gives us the order for a morning and evening service; and although there is very early mention made of private prayer occurring many times a day in monastic institutions and the like, still it does not appear that more than two hours were devoted to public prayer in the primitive times of the Church.* S. Chrysostom speaks of daily

* The learned Bingham, upon whom I have chiefly depended in the account of the ancient services given in the text, speaks of the "canonical hours" as merely the growth of monastic institutions, and not by any means a part of primitive practice:

"They who have made the most exact enquiries into the original of these as fixed hours of public prayer, can find no footsteps of them in the three first ages, but conclude they came first into the Church with the monastic life. So Mede (Ep. 66) and Bp. Pearson (Prælect. II. in Act. Apost. n. 3, 4), who observes that Tertullian mentions the third, sixth, and ninth hours of prayer; but then he is disputing as a Montanist against the Catholics, and urging the necessity of observing the rules of the Montanists in all the heights of their austerities and pretences of mortification and devotion above the Church .....Cyprian indeed recommends these hours of prayer, from the example of Daniel, and other arguments, to Christians in their private devotions. But he does not so much as once suggest that the Church had then by any rule made them the stated hours of public devotion, but only evening and morning early before day. All the rest of

service, morning and evening, and not oftener,—or, at most, three times a day;* and Epiphanius also,† in the like manner. At the close, however, of the sixth century, the practices of private devotion which had prevailed in the monasteries began to be extended to the churches and public congregations, and then it was that an increased number of services for each day were appointed, under what were generally called "*the Canonical Hours.*" These Canonical Hours may be described as follows: 1. Nocturns. 2. Lauds. 3. Prime, or the first hour. 4. The third hour. 5. The sixth hour. 6. The ninth hour. 7. Vespers. 8. Compline.

It is generally said that the "canonical hours" were seven, and it is explained in this way. The ancient Nocturns and Lauds were considered together as two parts of one service, and were placed under the joint name of Matins; sometimes they were distinguished as Nocturn Lauds and Matin Lauds. Nocturns were celebrated at midnight; Lauds or Matins at break of day; prime at six o'clock in the morning; the third hour at nine o'clock A.M.; the sixth hour at noon; the ninth hour at three o'clock P.M.; Vespers or Evensong at approaching dark; Completorium or Compline at bed-time. These hours have been observed by some persons to correspond with particular events in our Saviour's life; as for instance, the

their time they spent at work privately, joining private meditation of the Scriptures, singing of psalms, and prayers, continually with their labour. Not long after, the monasteries of Mesopotamia and Palestine set up the practice of meeting publicly at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, for performing their psalmody and devotions. But as yet there was no new morning service, distinct from that of the old morning service before day. This was first begun in the monastery of Bethleem, and thence propagated into others, but not received in all. And the completorium or bed-time service was utterly unknown to the ancients as distinct from the lucernaris or evening service, as Bona himself proves against Bellarmin. So that *these canonical hours came gradually into the Church, and are all of them owing to the rules of the Eastern monasteries for their original.*" — Bingham, *Ecc. Antiq.* book xiii, c. ix.

* Chrysostom. Hom. 18 in Act. p. 174, and Hom. 6 in 1 Tim. p. 1550,

† Epiphan. Expos. Fid. n. 33, tom. i, p. 1106, quoted by Bingham, book xiii, c. ix.

Nocturns (midnight) with our Saviour's birth and resurrection; and Prime, with the hour at which He was brought before Pilate: at the third hour our blessed Lord was scourged and delivered over to be crucified; at the sixth hour He was crucified; at the ninth hour He gave up the ghost: at Vespers He was taken down from the cross; and at Compline He endured the agony in the garden.* These coincidences may be pronounced by some to be fanciful. No great stress need be laid upon them, but still they are observable. At any rate, the care and system with which public prayer was thus pursued, and the constancy and assiduity with which the men of those days, as by this plan exemplified, thought it right to worship God, do show a degree of faith and devotion to which

* Collier, in his Church History, gives a somewhat different account, both of the hours and of the times of our Saviour's life which they represent. He says:

"They are commonly ranged under these distinctions: First, at cock-crowing, or the *Nocturnal*. This service was performed at two o'clock in the morning. The ground for pitching upon this hour is taken partly from David's saying, 'At midnight I will praise the Lord,' and partly from a tradition of our Saviour's rising from the dead about that time. Secondly, *Matins*. These were said at the first hour, or, according to our computation, at six o'clock. At this time the Jewish morning sacrifice was offered. The angels likewise are supposed to have acquainted the women with our Saviour's resurrection at this hour. Thirdly, the *Tierce*, which was at nine in the morning, when our Saviour was condemned and scourged by Pilate. Fourthly, the *Sexte*, or twelve at noon, when our Saviour was crucified, and the sun eclipsed in a total darkness. Fifthly, the *None*, or three in the afternoon. At this hour our Saviour expired; and besides, it was the hour for public prayer in the Temple. Sixthly, *Vespers*.—These were said at six in the afternoon. The reason for this time is, because the evening sacrifice was then offered in the Jewish Temple, and our blessed Saviour is supposed to have been taken down from the cross at this hour. Seventhly, *Compline*. This service was performed after seven, when our Saviour's agony in the garden was believed to begin. The monks going to bed at eight, had six hours to sleep before the nocturnal began, neither was it reckoned a fault if they went afterwards; but after matins they were not allowed that liberty."—*Collier's Ecclesiastical History*, part ii, book ii.

The difference in the way of counting the hours lies in the *Nocturns*. The "first hour" is called Matins; whereas, in other accounts, the Nocturns are the Matins, only called by the name of *Nocturn Lauds*, and *Matin Lauds*, as in the text.

we of the Church of England seem now to be perfect strangers. It is not meant by this that the "*canonical hours*" are in any way binding upon us as a Church, or that we without them should not be capable of as high a degree of devotion as the men of those days were with them. Far from it. But still, when we simply reflect that the great bulk of the English people are total strangers to public worship at *any* time of *any* day save Sunday, a comparison with the hours of prayer of former days cannot but astonish us. The Church of England, when she reduced her service book for public prayer to the simple Matins and Evensong, acted wisely, because more in unison with the Church of the earliest ages; but surely she contemplated that her simple Matins and Evensong *would be observed*. Matins she appointed as a junction of nocturns, lauds, and prime; and Evensong she appointed as a junction of vespers and compline. She has taken what is good and useful from the Romish Church,—she has left what was not in accordance with primitive practice. She leaves it of course open to every one to pray in private "without ceasing"; but for public worship, she appoints that public prayers be said twice on ordinary days, and on especial days of litany or communion, three times on each day.*

But now it is time that we approach our Prayer Book, as it stands before us at the present day. Let us look first at that direction at the close of the second Preface, which directs a daily service. It is thus:

> And all Priests and Deacons are to say daily the Morning and Evening Prayer either privately or openly, not being let by sickness, or some other urgent cause.
>
> And the Curate that ministereth in every Parish Church or Chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the Parish Church or Chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a Bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word, and to pray with him.

* It may be observed that our Church, in her first Reformation, did still contemplate the duty of her members in the work of prayer to be far more than merely to observe a public attendance twice a day. There was a book published by Royal authority, A.D. 1560, including

Can any candid and reasonable person take up this direction, and still say it is not the Church's intention that her service should be performed *daily?* If words have any meaning at all, these words command, with only one exception (that of sickness, or other URGENT CAUSE), that not only *some* priests and deacons, but *every* priest and deacon, shall say the service contained in the book; *privately*, if such priest or deacon be without cure of souls; and *publicly*, if he be invested with the parochial charge of a parish, causing a bell to toll, that his parishoners may join with him.* But let us go on, and examine the book

six hours of prayer. The Primer also contained psalms, hymns, and lessons, for six hours of prayer. These, however, were intended for *private devotion*. It is astonishing, the more we search and read, how deficient we find our present tone of mind in regard to devotional exercises. Who in these days would think of dedicating himself in mind and body to six times of devotion through the day? And yet we here find it among our immediate ancestors not only as very possible, but as a duty enjoined.—See Mr. Palmer's observations in *The Antiquities of the Ancient Ritual*, chap. i, part i, Introduction.

* The responsibility of the observance of the daily service rests upon the laity to form a congregation, but primarily upon the clergy to give them the opportunity. It may be with truth asserted that the congregation was never yet wanting (two or three persons at the least), when the *priest* was not wanting: and even if there be no congregation, still it is a question whether the word "*privately*" in the rubric will not mean "*by himself*," as "*openly*" means "*when there is a congregation.*" But, however, let the priest begin the service. The holy angels, at any rate, will pray *with him*, and he *for his people*; and the more the people are absent, the more need of his prayers in their behalf. Bishop Overall says:

"We are all bound, as all priests are in the Church of Rome, daily to repeat and say the public service of the Church; and it is a precept the most useful and necessary of any other that belongs to the minister of God, and such as have care of other men's souls; would men regard it and practise it a little more than they do among us! We are all for *preaching* now; and as for attending the service and prayers appointed by the Church for God's worship and the good of all men, we think that too mean an offer for us, and therefore, as if it were not worth our labours, we commonly hire others under us to do it, more to satisfy the law than to be answerable to our duties. Here is a command that binds us every day to say the morning and evening prayer. How many are the men that are noted to do it? It is well that they have a back door for an exeuse to come out at here; for, good men, they are so belaboured with studying divinity, and preaching the word, that they have no leisure to read these same

narrowly, and observe its construction generally. Has it the character of a service performed at distant intervals, or has it the character of a continual stream of devotion? Look first at the direction about reading Holy Scripture: "It is so planned," says our Prayer Book, "that all the whole Bible should be read over in the Church once every year." Look at the appointment of the Psalms: "The Psalter shall be read through once every month, as it is there appointed, both for morning and evening prayer." Look at the directions which are reiterated about the

common prayers; as if it were not a chief part of their office and charge committed unto them. Certainly the people whose souls they have care of, reap as great benefit, and more too, by these prayers, which their pastors are daily to make unto God for them, either privately or publicly, as they can do by their preaching; for God is more respective to the prayers which they make *for the people*, than ever the people are to the sermons which they make to them."

Bp. Fell also, in his charge to his clergy (1685), says thus:

"If I require a constant diligence in offering the daily sacrifice of *prayer for the people* at those returns which the Church enjoins, the usual answer is, they are ready to do their duty, but the people will not be prevailed with to join with them; and so when the minister has thoroughly accused his flock, he thinks he has absolved himself. His Church becomes a sinecure; and because others forbear to do their duty, there remains none for him to do. But, my brethren, if our people be negligent, we are the more obliged to industry; if they are indevout, we ought to be more zealous; if they are licentious, we ought to be more exemplary. Nor let any man say that the people will not be prevailed upon. How know we what will be hereafter? They who resisted one attempt, may yield to another; or if they yield not to a single instance, they may to many, and more pressing."

In the same language Dean Comber speaks:

"To my brethren of the clergy, that they will read these prayers so frequently, that such as have leisure may never want opportunity thus to serve God, and so fervently, that those who do attend them may be brought into an high esteem of them. It was a great end of God's instituting the priest's office, and a principal motive to our pious ancestors in their liberal provisions for it, that there might be an order of men on purpose to *pray daily for all mankind*, especially for such as could not daily attend divine service. So that if we neglect this daily sacrifice, we neither answer the designs of God nor of our benefactors. And as we are not excused by, so we ought not to be discouraged at, the people's slowness in coming to daily prayers; for their presence is indeed a comfort to us, and an advantage to themselves; but their absence doth not hinder the success, nor should it obstruct the performance, of our prayers. The promise of Jesus is made to two or three; and since our petitions are di-

Lessons: "The Old Testament is appointed for the first lessons at morning and evening prayer, so as the most part thereof will be read every year once. The New Testament is appointed for the second lessons at morning and evening prayer, and shall be read over every year thrice." Look again at the title which stands at the commencement of the service: "The Order for Morning Prayer *daily throughout the Year*." "The Order for Evening Prayer *daily throughout the Year*." Look again at the hymn *Te Deum*. Observe the rubric which directs it:

rected to God, we need not regard *who is absent*, so long as *He is present to whom we speak*."—Comber Preface, *Companion to the Temple*, ad finem.

So also, to come to more modern times, we shall find, even very lately, Bishop Mant (the present Bishop of Down and Connor) charging his clergy on the same ground. He speaks thus:

"Reducing the seven-fold daily office of the Romish Breviary to a number more agreeable to a reasonable service, and better adapted for the observance and benefit of her congregations, the Reformed Anglican Church appointed a daily order of morning and evening prayer, adding thereto special services for certain days, which she required to be kept holy. To what extent the observance of these holy days, as well as the celebration of the order of morning and evening prayer prevailed among our people, and how long they were to any considerable extent continued, it may be not easy to determine; that they did prevail, however, more or less in England, during the seventeenth century, we learn on the testimony of the cotemporary biographers of Herbert, Sanderson, and Hammond, who lived in successive periods of that century; for of Herbert it is related, by Isaac Walton, that in the country village of Bemerton, near Salisbury, it was his practice to appear constantly with his wife, and three nieces, the daughters of a deceased sister, and the whole family, twice every day at the church prayers in the chapel, which did almost join his parsonage house; and for the time of his appearing, it was strictly at the canonical hours of ten and four, and then and there he lifted up pure and charitable hands to God, in the midst of the congregation. From the language of the same biographer, concerning the reading of the church prayers, and the decent and regular service of God, it is to be inferred that a practice similar to that of Herbert, was observed by Sanderson in the small country town of Boothby Pannel; whilst Bishop Fell records, in the life of Hammond, that, in his country rectory of Penshurst, the offices of prayer he had in his church, not only upon Sunday, and festivals, and their eves, as also Wednesdays and Fridays, according to the appointment of the Rubric, but every day in the week, and twice on Saturdays, and Holy Eves, for his assistance wherein he kept a curate, and allowed him a comfortable salary."

"The hymn called *Te Deum laudamus* to be sung or said *daily throughout the year*." And observe the words of that beautiful hymn. How men lose the beauty and the devotion, if not the *truth* of that hymn, who use it only one day in the week: "DAY BY DAY we magnify thee." Look once more at the direction of the Collects, as in the season of Advent. The rubric directs thus: "This Collect is to be repeated *every day*." And that for Ash Wednesday: "This Collect is to be read *every day* in Lent." The rubric after the Collect for S. Stephen's day: "Then shall follow the Collect for the Nativity, which shall be said *continually* unto new year's eve." The rubric after the Gospel of the Circumcision: "The same Collect, Gospel, and Epistle, shall serve for *every day after* unto the Epiphany." The rubric for the second and third Collects at morning prayer: "Then shall follow three Collects; the first *for the day*,...&c. And the two last Collects shall never alter, *but daily be said at morning prayer throughout all the year*." And in the evening: "which two last Collects shall *be daily said at evening prayer without alteration*." The rubric for the prayer in Ember weeks: "In the Ember weeks to be said *every day* for those that are to be admitted into holy orders."

If these expressions, taken as a whole, do not manifest the desire of our Church for a *daily service*, it is impossible to say what could do so. The whole construction of the service book rest on this idea. With it, it is a perfect compendium of Scriptural instruction and devotion; without it, it is spiritless and meaningless. With it, we may compete with the Church of Rome, or any other Church, in the national offerings of a devout people; without it, we sink into an ungrateful and lethargic selfishness, and must not wonder at a population springing up around us who are without God in the world.

But perhaps all that has been said will readily be granted. That our Prayer Book *is* constructed for a daily service,—that Christians in the earlier ages of the Church *did* perform a daily service,—that it is right in abstract theory that this daily service *should* be offered,—all this may be allowed; but withal objections will be taken on

grounds such as these : " Times are different now. What was very reasonable and possible in the primitive Christians, ceases to be so with us. We are living in different circumstances. Our habits of life are changed. Duties which were required of them, cannot be required of us." To these objections, as resting upon facts, we are of course compelled immediately to assent. Times *are* changed. Christians in the nineteenth century are *not* as Christians in the second or third. But is it fair to argue, that because we are not the same, therefore our religious duties and privileges are not the same? Religion cannot but be religion. Christianity cannot but be Christianity once for all. *We* may alter, but surely Christianity cannot alter. The question is, to what cause are we to impute the difference which exists between our habits and those of the early Christians? Is it to a wrong cause, or to a right cause? If to a wrong cause, would not our duty be to purify and adjust that cause, rather than seek to dislodge and subvert all notions of right and wrong, by making religious duty square with ourselves, rather than ourselves with religious duty? It is true, life must be maintained, and business pursued; nations must be governed; statesmen must have their politics, merchants their exchange, lawyers their courts, and tradesmen their shops. We must be in the world: undoubtedly. But was there not the same necessity for all these duties in the early ages of Christianity as there is at present? Had the early Christians no world to live in, no life to maintain, no business to pursue? Surely we are not to fancy that the Romans, Greeks, and Africans, were so blessed as to be free from the pursuits and occupations which now engage us. S. Chrysostom brings in a man excusing himself, even in those days, from his attendance in church at daily service: " How is it possible for me, who am a man of the world, and pinned down to the courts of law, to run to church and pray at the three hours of the day?"* They had courts of law, they had the forum, they had the market, they had the exchange, just as much as we; only they had,

* Chrys. Hom. de Ann. tom. i, p. 995.

as Christians, minds which used these things but as secondary, not as primary. We place the world first, religion second. They did the reverse. They would have pleasure and indulgence subject to prayer,—we would have prayer subject to pleasure and indulgence. No: it is not the world that has changed, but the tone of our faith and love. Theirs was fresh, vigorous, and energetic; ours is cold, languid, and inert. It is not our duties without, but our minds within. The world has become all in all to us. Our excessive toil in the things of mammon, which we dignify by the name of business, and then think it a *duty*,—and our excessive luxury in pleasure, which we dignify by the name of *using the blessings which God has given us*, and then think it a *right*,—have weaned our affections away from God, and made us think that we are independent of Him. Our prosperity, our national successes, and our domestic comforts, have dulled our capacities, and blinded our minds, and made our hearts gross, so that we recognize no longer the mighty hand and the outstretched arm of the living God, which hangs above us; and see no need of prayer. Our politics succeed, our trade thrives, our armies win victories, great balance sheets display huge sums of the mammon of unrighteousness to be ours, beyond all other nations;—and then, in proportion beyond all other nations, we exclaim that we are different now from what Christians were in former ages; and so, daily national prayer is an obsolete practice, and unnecessary for such as we. O, my brethren, would that we had a little less worldliness, and more of prayer; a little more of poverty, and a little less hardness of heart. It would seem as if we required some signal chastisement from God,— some plague, or pestilence, or war,—some frightful national calamity, to bring us on our knees to the houses of prayer, for God's *mercy* does not seem to do so.

Another objection brought against the necessity of daily public worship is this,—that family worship supersedes it; and it is said, that to join private family worship with daily prayers in church, would be a useless work, and a burden too great for men to bear. It may be allowed that family worship does in some instances become a substitute for

church worship, as where the dwelling of a parishioner is so distant, that he cannot conveniently go to and fro each day, or where sickness or infirmity may occur, and the like. But these are *accidents;* they do not militate against the system of church worship in general; they can only be brought forward as individual exceptions.

Let us consider. If family worship *does* supersede public worship, why may it not do so on Sunday as well as on every other day? For, observe, in regard to Sunday, there is no especial command in the evangelical dispensation to make one day a day of worship above another. The Sunday indeed is the great Christian *festival,*—the Lord's day,—a day of thanksgiving and record of mercies; but it is not said that it is a day of public prayer beyond any other day. It is indeed the great day of the week for rest, and rejoicing, and the holy eucharist; but in regard to prayer, it cannot be said that it takes to itself any peculiarity above other days. The Apostles were daily *in the Temple.* No; family worship may be a very good thing, but church worship is a *better.* It is well and right that we meet in our households to praise God, but it is far better and more right that the house of God should receive us within its gates, to praise God *there.* It is difficult to divest ourselves of prejudices long formed, and of habits in which we have been brought up; but surely the common principles of worship will show that the sacrifice of prayer and praise will be more acceptably received before God, when it is offered in His own house, than it could be in the common houses of men. We are all private recipients of private blessings. For these we praise God in private. We are likewise, many of us, recipients of domestic blessings. For these we praise God in our domestic worship. But why should we stop just at that point? Why should we not go forward, and consider that we are recipients of many blessings and privileges as members of one great family,—one great household,—*the Church?* We have a country, a sovereign, a government, magistrates, clergy. Our relationship in these several capacities should also be considered, as well as those of our private households. To worship God only in our families

is constrained, cold, selfish, and illiberal. It has the appearance of reserve, and unwillingness to remember others. A *parish* is a family. *Congregations* are families. The pastor and his flock ought to meet together as the *family of God;* not as several families disunited, and each looking for its own interests, and following its own ways, having separate wants, and holding aloof one from the other,—but one in Christ; one in His sanctuary, and one in prayer; as one in wants, and sorrows, and infirmities.

But take another view. Supposing that family worship should be faithfully and reverently performed in the houses of the noble and rich (though even there it cannot be performed with *such* reverence as in the house of God, and must ever be inferior, as being only lay-worship), but even if we take the case in its best aspect, and find a room set apart for the worship of God, and all things in that worship done decently and in order; and supposing, on that ground, we were to allow this to be, in some sort, a substitute for the daily worship of the Church,— still, what is to become of the thousands and thousands of the poor and middle classes, who have no place in which they can assemble in any decent order, perhaps living altogether, and performing all the duties of life in one room? What are we to say of the young and aged who live by themselves? What are we to say of the ignorant, who know not how to pray? or of the poor, who have neither Bible nor Prayer Book; and if they had, would neither have knowledge nor ability to guide others, even if they could pray themselves? It must be evident that the world is made up of a vast majority of these latter classes; and if the idea is sanctioned that family prayer is a substitute for church prayer,—if the rich and noble, living together in large establishments, are allowed to enjoy their privilege of family prayer, and on that ground to set aside, as a system, church prayer,—how obvious it is that a vital injury will be done to habits of devotion altogether, and that the great body of the people will be trained up in ungodliness and irreverence. It is, once more, a selfish and heartless proceeding. It disjoins and separates the rich, the prosperous, and those blessed with abundance, from

the poor, the solitary, and the unfortunate. It breaks up that unity of spirit and unity of heart which ought to join us all, of every kind and degree, together, *as one family in Christ.*

Every day points out to us how much we stand in need of God's grace; how much, as a nation, we are deficient in the fruits of the Spirit; how much, as a Church, we fall short of the gifts with which God has blessed us. What want of union there is among us! what discord, what rebellion against authority, what searching in every man for his own ways! May we not in great part attribute this to our separation from one another in the daily offices of prayer? Contemplate our position as a people, and our position as individuals. Look to the ancient Christians, who thought it not too much to pray in public seven times a day, and to send up the "calves of their lips," in a constant stream of public praise, never ceasing. Think, each of you, of your *daily* wants, your *daily* sins, your *daily* dangers; and consider whether you have not *need* of *daily prayer*. Think of the mercies *daily* vouchsafed,—the sun which rises *daily* to warm and clothe the earth,—the light and air which *daily* are renewed for your comfort and sustenance,—God's holy spirit, which *daily* comes to warn and direct you,—holy angels, which *daily* come from God's throne on high, to stand round about and guard you: think that not for one instant is life yours, or health, or soundness of mind, or vigour of body, or power to see, or hear, or understand, or believe, or the blessing to possess hopes of glory, or enjoy means of grace. Think, in short, how every moment you depend upon God; and then is it too much to ask that you should spare one hour a day for His worship,—one hour to enter into His courts with thanksgiving, and sing praises unto His name?

How is it that our souls are fixed to *earth*, but because we never lift them up to heaven? How is it that we complain of temptation being too strong for us, but because we do not pray to be relieved from it? How is it that *nationally* we are a *worldly, time-serving, cold-hearted* people, all classes given (as it seems) without a respite, to the mammon of unrighteousness, without power to shake

it off, but because *nationally* we are not a people of *public, national*, CHURCH *prayer?* How awful is the language of S. James! and may it not in great part be applied to us, as a nation full of riches? "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl, for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered, and the rust of them shall be a witness against you, and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last day. Behold the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth, and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth. Ye have lived in pleasure on the earth, and been wanton; ye have nourished your hearts as in a day of slaughter."

O, that we could shake off this cankering of mammon, and this wantonness of luxury;—that we could REALIZE the fond wishes of our Church;—that we could but see our clergy daily ministering at her altars, as though that were their great work, *interceding in daily prayer;*—that we could see our nobility and gentry manfully divesting themselves of the lethargic apathy with which they speak of the things of God, their love for ease and pleasure, and heed for little else but pomp, and ostentation, and vanity;—that we could see our POOR, our labourers and mechanics, spared from their hard taskmasters, that grind them to the dust in the sweat of their brow, working riches out of *their* labour,—spared, but for some short moments, for a daily prayer in God's house. Surely we should be a nation nearer to God than we are. There would be more blessing in our preaching, more union in our Church, more charity in our opinions, more gentleness in our language, more honesty in our dealings. God would be more in our hearts,—JESUS, our ever-blessed and adorable Saviour, more in our faith.

SERMON VI.

THE CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCH.

PSALM cxix, 8.

"*I will keep thy ceremonies.*"

SINCE it has pleased Almighty God to make man not as the holy angels, who are creatures of spirit only, but to clothe and encompass his spirit within a frame-work of corporeal senses, it seems to follow that in the works by which God and man are connected together, this double nature of man, the corporeal as well as the spiritual, should be considered. It is through the body that God most generally works in man the operations of His grace —as by poverty, sickness, disease, infirmity, and pain— and it is by the body, or the organs of the body, that man seeks to express and communicate unto God his prayers and his praises. We cry out to represent our wants; we fall prostrate or kneel down to represent our humility; we lift up our hands to signify our praise; and we bow down our heads to signify our adoration. All these are bodily tokens by which naturally we pourtray both to God and ourselves the mind within.

And if this be so with men *individually*, it must be much more so in those dealings between man and God, which men meet together to perform *collectively*. The mind is acted upon and influenced by external objects of sense both for evil and for good. All the passions of which we are the subjects, lie dormant, until roused by things external. All the temptations by which we are assailed, come through these passions; and were it not

that we had sight, hearing, and touch, Satan would have but little power over us. But the very same organs which may be stimulated to evil, by evil objects of sense, may, by good and holy objects of sense, be stimulated to good, so that when men meet together for a holy purpose, it seems but consistent with their nature, that plans should be devised for regulating objects of sense, so as to bear upon this universal principle. The question is,—are prayer and devotion likely to be increased by external objects of sense? If they are, then men act rightly in so planning and regulating such external objects as to produce this effect. What is the case in the courts of our Kings—in our armies—in our courts of law—in our legislative assemblies? Are they not all planned with this object in view:—to create awe, and reverence, and the subjugation of the mind, by the magnificence, and order, and solemnity which is observed in their great public acts and meetings? Do they not for this reason abound in ceremonial observances? Is it not notorious how minutely and exactly every little matter of detail is arranged, and how any—the slightest—infringement of the appointed order of their customs is watched and guarded against?

And if this be true in things of mere human reference, it is likely to be true in things divine. The analogy between Nature and Religion is no less real here than in other things. Hence the religion of the Israelites in ceremonial observances abounding. Hence the Levitical laws descending into every minute detail of word and action. There is hardly any portion of the Jewish religion which is not symbolical. All tends to this point:—all works (and, let us remember, by the express direction of God) towards the creation of devotional worship by external objects of sense. Things done and things said with an outward form and sign, magnificence in ritual, grandeur in building, order in prayer, solemnity in music, beauty in vestments—all these are points brought forward by holy men of God, with a knowledge that such external things are both creatives and helps of the inward devotion of the spirit. They act and re-act in several ways. First, they cherish and direct devotion, and then they represent it.

First, they bring it out in the individual mind, and then by sympathy they carry it on from the individual mind to great masses of people when congregated together, as being tokens looked upon, and significant signs of real things within.*

These observations are prefatory to the subject which it is my desire to discuss in the following Lecture. For this purpose, let us take up the next paragraph of the Second Preface of the Book of Common Prayer. It is headed thus :—

"OF CEREMONIES. WHY SOME BE ABOLISHED AND SOME RETAINED."

This portion of the Preface alludes to the same period of time as that of which I spoke in the last Lecture. It breathes exactly the same spirit,—that of moderation,—that of taking the middle path between the corruptions which the Roman Church had introduced among us, and the unmeaning objections which the Puritans raised against every sort of ceremony whatsoever. While it allows that ceremonial observances may be perverted by indiscreet devotion, and zeal without knowledge (in fact when a cere-

* The learned Hooker esteems the value of external ceremonies as even higher than stimulants of devotion, for he speaks of them as *edifying the understanding.* "The end which is aimed at in setting down the outward form of all religious actions, is the *edification of the Church.* Now men are edified, when either their understanding is taught somewhat whereof in such actions it behoveth all men to consider, or when their hearts are moved with any affection suitable thereto; when their minds are in any sort stirred up unto that reverence, devotion, attention, and due regard, which in those cases seemeth requisite. Because, therefore, unto this purpose not only speech, but sundry sensible means besides, have always been thought necessary, and especially those means which being objects to the eye, the liveliest and most apprehensive sense of all other, have in that respect seemed the fittest to make a deep and strong impression. From hence have arisen not only a number of prayers, readings, questionings, exhortings, but even of visible signs also, which, being used in performance of holy actions, are undoubtedly most effectual to open such matter, as men, when they know and remember carefully, must needs be a great deal the better informed to what effect such duties serve."—*Hooker, Eccl. Pol.* book iv, § 1.

monial observance produces superstition, not devotion,—when it darkens the understanding, instead of instructing it,—it is no longer fulfilling its purpose, and therefore is mischievous instead of useful), while it allows this, as common sense would dictate, still it fully and without any compromise maintains the utility and Scriptural foundation of such ceremonies as are appointed and set forth in the Book of Common Prayer.

Let us first read a portion of that which our Church has authoritatively set forth on this head.

Of CEREMONIES, why some be abolished, and some retained.

Of such Ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man, some at the first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition: some entered into the Church by undiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge; and for because they were winked at in the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away and clean rejected: other there be, which although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still, as well for a decent order in the Church (for the which they were first devised), as because they pertain to edification, whereunto all things done in the Church (as the Apostle teacheth) ought to be referred.

And although the keeping or omitting of a ceremony, in itself considered, is but a small thing: yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline is no small offence before God. "Let all things be done among you," saith S. Paul, "in a seemly and due order"; the appointment of the which order pertaineth not to private men; therefore no man ought to take in hand, nor presume to appoint or alter any publick or common order in Christ's Church, except he be lawfully called and authorized thereunto.

And whereas in this our time the minds of men are so diverse, that some think it a great matter of conscience to depart from a piece of the least of their Ceremonies, they be so addicted to their old customs; and again, on the other side, some be so new-fangled, that they would innovate all things, and so despise the old, that nothing can like them, but that is new: it was thought expedient, not so much to have respect how to please and satisfy either of these parties, as how to please God, and profit them both. And yet lest any man should be offended, whom good reason might satisfy, here be certain causes rendered, why some of the accustomed Ceremonies be put away, and some retained and kept still.

Flowing from this, I shall first endeavour to set forth the Scriptural and ecclesiastical grounds of *ceremonial observances;* then give some account of the abuse of this principle by the Church of Rome; and then mention those ceremonies of our own Church which are still retained among us.

And first in regard to the Holy Scriptures. As before observed, the Jewish religion was peculiarly a religion of ceremony. All their customs, as well in transactions between man and man, as between man and God, abounded in signs. As for instance in taking an oath: when Abraham sent his servant to seek a wife for Isaac, the form under which he bound him was this: "Put, I pray thee, thy hand under my thigh, and I will make thee swear by the Lord." (Gen. xxiv, 2.) Again, in the Book of Ruth we find a ceremonial observance in regard to the right of a kinsman: "Now this was the manner in former times in Israel concerning redeeming, and concerning changing, for to confirm all things: A man plucked off his shoe and gave it to his neighbour, and this was a testimony in Israel." (Ruth iv, 7.) But in regard more particularly to *religion.* The law of sacrifice was itself a ceremony,—an external act, picturing the atonement; and all those laws which flowed out of and depended upon sacrifice, in like manner pictured to the world some peculiarities of the atonement; as the passover (Exodus xii.) and the scapegoat (Levit. xvi.) Every one, however slightly acquainted with Scripture, will call to mind the ceremony of *circumcision,* and its meaning, the *anointing* with oil, the *washing* with water, the *sprinkling* with blood, the laws of *redemption* for servants, and the like. All these show that the principle of ceremonial observance is deeply embedded in the religion of the law.

But all this may readily be granted by the disputant, and granted in order to found upon it the superiority of the Gospel. The minuteness and the burdensome character of the law, it is allowed, were so great, that the Gospel is called, in reference to it, "the law of liberty." The ceremonies of the law are spoken of under the term "beggarly elements"; and we are continually exhorted not "to re-

turn to them": we are told "not to be subject to ordinances"; "not to judge one another in meat or drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days." These and similar expressions are continually met with in the Epistles: and by these some are led to speak against all ceremonial usages whatsoever, as if banished from the religion of the Gospel.

But the inference, that because the Apostle speaks in this manner against the *Jewish* ceremonies, therefore he means to speak against *all* ceremonies, is surely an erroneous one. He is addressing Jews that had become Christians. He is guarding them against recurring to the type, when they had embraced and fulfilled the antitype. To them, as Jews, those ceremonies were right; but, as Christians, they were not right, because the end of those ceremonies had been fulfilled. He does not find fault with the *principle* of ceremonial observances, but with those particular ceremonial observances which Moses had laid down in preparation for Christ, and the purpose of which had been accomplished by the coming of Christ. With this view he in one place calls the law "*a schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ.*" (Gal. iii, 24.) And it is evident to every one, that when the *object* of the teaching is achieved, the office of the schoolmaster, as a *means* towards that object, is abolished. Being brought unto Christ, we have no further need of the schoolmaster. And so it was. Take, for instance, circumcision; its end had ceased for Christians, and baptism stood in its place. The passover; its end had ceased for Christians, and the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world, represented in the Eucharist, had come in its place. The scape-goat; its end had ceased, and the atoning Son of God had been before the world crucified and slain once for all. The *Urim and Thummim;* its end had ceased, and God's presence was now in the gift of the Holy Ghost, shed forth abundantly upon the Apostles, and speaking through the *Church* to all mankind. The *anointing with oil;* its end had ceased, in the unction of the Holy Spirit, both of Christ in being the anointed *prophet, priest,* and *king,* and of Christians, as being from Him and in Him, "priests and kings unto God." The *sprink-*

ling of blood; its end had ceased, in the blood of the Son of God being shed for the sins of the whole world, and the sprinkling of our consciences from dead works to serve the living God.

And so I might go on. These indeed, being types, are as *types*, "beggarly elements", when once we possess the *antitype;* and then they are not again to be recurred to. But so far from showing that no ceremonial observances are pleasing to God, they all most assuredly mark the *principle as being most acceptable to Him, as of His own appointment;* only this must be added, that such principle is not of necessity to be developed in exactly the same manner at different periods of His revelation.

But let us advert to our Lord Himself, and observe the character both of His example and His teaching. In the first place, our Lord was *circumcised;* but He had no need of circumcision, for that which circumcision typified was not in Him, He being holy and clean, and without spot of sin. In the next place, He was "*presented in the Temple*", but He had no need of this ceremony, for He was God's only Son, and God, and had been presented before God the Father from all eternity. In the next place, He was *baptised;* but He had no need of baptism; and when S. John Baptist expressed his astonishment at it, He cried: "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to *fulfil all righteousness*"; and this is a very remarkable answer: it became Him—*Him* who was above all law and all ceremony, to submit to a law and a ceremony, in order *to fulfil all righteousness.* Now Christ was in all things "our example, that we should follow His steps;" He was therefore an example in this respect, that ceremonial things for God's glory and *all righteousness* are true parts of Christianity.

But let us pursue Him in His teaching. After that remarkable baptism, our Lord went forth in His public authoritative capacity, and began to preach repentance and the kingdom of God; and if anything is remarkable in the whole course of that teaching, it is the *emblematic*, the *symbolical*, the *ceremonial* manner, in which He taught. In the ninth chapter of S. John, in curing a blind man,

"He made clay with spittle, and anointed the blind man with clay", — an external ceremonial action; for, of course, He could have healed the blind man with a word alone, if He had so pleased. When the sick generally were brought to Him, He *laid His hands upon them*,—a symbolical action; for, of course, the sick could have been cured without the laying on of hands. Again, towards the close of His life, He used a very remarkable sign: "He took a towel, and girded Himself, and washed His disciples' feet;" and afterwards He told them the reason of His doing so,—it was to teach them humility. But why could He not have taught them humility, as He had often done before, by plain words? It pleased Him to do otherwise, because this symbol, this ceremony, would be more impressive, as conveying, by a bodily action, more than words could have done. Again, when He was about finally to depart from the world, He solemnly charged His apostles, and gave unto them the Holy Ghost. It is said by S. John that He did it in this way: "He *breathed* on them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost." Why was it not sufficient to convey the spiritual gift, *without the breathing?* We cannot tell; but we know that HE thought it not sufficient. He on that occasion did employ an outward ceremonial action,—He *breathed;* signifying by *breath* the SPIRIT of God, which was to go from Him to them externally, and yet withal to make them internally the Apostles of His kingdom.

Now all these things which I have mentioned speak clearly to the value and meaning of ceremonies in religious teaching, as a *principle.* As to particular Church ordinances,—that He, our Lord and Master, did desire that in Church assemblies symbolical and ceremonial rites should be observed, we cannot of course have better assurance than by the two sacraments. These two sacraments He appointed for His Church; not to be optional, but necessary to salvation. In holy baptism we find an internal grace promised to be conveyed by an outward channel. We find the pouring of, or immersion in, water, with a form of words by Him appointed. In the holy eucharist we find the outward elements of bread and wine

charged with the mysterious efficacy of conveying to the soul of man communion with the Lord Jesus Christ. We are told, that if in faith and repentance we approach and eat the bread and wine of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, we eat and drink His body and His blood; we are one with Him, and He one with us. And yet this is in its external aspect a mere ceremony, a mere symbolical action; but inasmuch as it was commanded by our Lord Himself, it becomes real religion. Who can gainsay this?

Passing on from the example and teaching of our Lord, as set forth to us in the Gospels, and coming to His *Church*, as represented in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, we find the use of the following ceremonial actions distinctly borne witness to, and so sanctioned and appointed. In the sixth chapter of the Acts, "*laying on of hands*", as for ordination of ministers. In the eighth chapter, "*laying on of hands*" again, as for confirmation of the baptized. In S. Peter v, 14, the "*kiss of peace.*" In 1 Cor. xi, 7, the custom of "*covered and uncovered heads*", in church worship. In S. James v, 14, "*the anointing of the sick with oil.*" Put all this together, and then sum it up by reference to that remarkable passage of S. Paul, where he distinctly alludes to *customs* in a Church, as though each Church might appoint her own customs, by which her members were to be bonnd. It occurs in 1 Cor. xi. The Corinthians had been disputing about some ceremonial observance; and he says in rebuke of them, "But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the Churches of God". It is clear that we may from this infer that the Churches of that day *had* customs,—had outward rites and ordinances in religious worship; and if so, then our whole Scriptural argument is complete; being deduced from the example of our Lord, from the Apostles, and from the custom of the early Chnrches; and we cannot therefore but infer the propriety of such observances, as well as their utility, and consistency with spiritual Christianity.

The next stage in our tracing of religious ceremonies will be in the early apostolic Churches,—that is, subsequent to the times of the New Testament. The due preserva-

ion of the two sacraments will of course in themselves nvolve a ceremonial observance ; but the early Churches vent much further than a bare observance of the sacraments. They thought themselves justified in adding many ubsidiary rites which might either explain their meaning r add solemnity to their performance. Thus, in the first acrament, that of holy baptism,—besides the use of water n the name of the holy Trinity,—which are essential parts f baptism,—there was first the ceremony of *renunciation*, n which the candidate solemnly forsook and abandoned he devil and the world. He stood with his face to the west, hat quarter being the supposed abode of Satan. He then tretched out his hands as against Satan, and used some gesture by which he signified his abhorrence and rejection f him. Then turning round to the east, he made his covenant of obedience with the Sun of Righteousness, whose disciple he came to be. All this is described by S. Cyril f Jerusalem, by S. Ambrose, and S. Jerome.* Another ceremony which in the ancient Church accompanied baptism, was *anointing*. It is mentioned by Cyril of Jerusalem, who says that men were anointed from head to foot with exorcised or consecrated oil, and that the oil was a symbol of their partaking of the fulness of Christ ;† and compared them also with the wrestlers in the arena. S. Ambrose says : "Thou camest to the font, and wast anointed as a champion of Christ, to fight the fight of this world."‡ But of course a better signification of it would be the anointing of *consecration;* that as Christ was anointed, so should the Christian be. But however generally used, anointing never was esteemed as *essential* to baptism, only as an adjunct and additional emblem giving a spiritual meaning. Together with the anointing was also used the *sign of the cross* which was made on he forehead of the person baptised ; and we may as well emark here that the sign of the cross was very general among the early Christians, at other times besides bap-

* Cyril. Catech. Myst. 1, n. 2, p. 278. Hieron. in Amos. vi, 14. Ambros. De Initiatis. cap. 2.

† Cyril. Catech. Myst. 2, n. 3.

‡ Ambros. De Sacram. lib. i, c. 2.

tism. Again, the consecration of the water in baptism was accompanied with much ceremony, and the sign of the cross. There was an invocation of the Holy Spirit, and a prayer of blessing. The form of the words is preserved in the Book of the Constitutions. We may add to this, the ceremony of the Trine immersion,—that is, immersion or aspersion, not, as now used, *once*, but three times, as emblematic of the Holy Trinity.* And again, there was the ceremony of taking off the clothes, very full of meaning, as conveying the idea of "putting off the old man." The candidates for baptism were totally immersed, and that naked ; by which again was represented the being buried with Christ in baptism, as, in like manner, the rising up out of the water would signify the resurrection to a new life. After baptism immediately followed confirmation, and this also with many ceremonies, confirmation being a part of baptism ; and at this time a new white garment was given to the candidate. This white garment was worn for eight days, and then laid up in the church. The white robe of baptism is constantly alluded to by the Fathers. The words with which it was

* There seems to have been great diversity, in different ages of the Church, in regard to Trine immersion : and its use seems to have been adopted or forsaken generally in reference to the prevalence of heretical opinions on the subject of the Godhead. If there were any heresy tending towards Arianism, the Trine immersion would mark the doctrine of the Church as in the Three Persons. If, on the contrary, any heresy might prevail in speaking of the Trinity as three, not persons, but natures, so as to impugn the doctrine of the Unity, then the Church would adopt the ceremony of *one* immersion,—one, as belonging equally to all the persons of the Trinity *as one*. Hooker says : "The element of water in baptism is necessary; once to lay it on, or thrice, is indifferent. For which cause, Gregory, making mention thereof saith : 'To dive an infant either thrice or but once in baptism, can be no way a thing reprovable, seeing that both in *three* times washing, the Trinity of Persons, and in *one*, the Unity of the Godhead may be signified.'"—*Eccl. Pol.* book iv, § 12. The first book of Edward the Sixth commanded *Trine* immersion. The following is the Rubric : "Then the priest shall take the child in his hands, and ask the name. And naming the child, shall dip it in the water thrice, first dipping the right side, second the left side, and the third time dipping the face towards the font, so it be discreetly and warily done." In the second book, as in our own present book, it is left optional, nothing being said either way.

delivered were these: "Receive the white and immaculate garment, which thou mayest bring forth without spot before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou mayest have eternal life."* And this custom still gives to one of our Sundays its peculiar title; for the principal day of baptism in the early Church was the feast of Pentecost, and it was called "Dominica in albis," *i. e.* "The Lord's day in white," from which is derived our name of White or Whit Sunday. And there were even still further ceremonies attached to baptism; as the carrying of lights, signifying the light and purity of the baptised; and the "kiss of peace," signifying his charity; and the tasting of honey and milk, signifying that as they were newly-born, they were to feed upon the simplest things, and alluding perhaps to the text: "As new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the word."

Such were the ceremonial observances which in very early times accompanied the sacrament of baptism. Let us now observe upon the second sacrament. In this we shall find such customs as the following: The offering of oblations upon the altar—signifying sacrifice—out of which oblations the bread and wine were taken to be consecrated for the sacrament. Water was mixed with wine, in token of the union between Christ and His people. S. Cyprian says: "In sanctifying the cup, the water cannot be offered alone, as neither can the wine be offered alone; for if the wine be offered by itself, the blood of Christ begins to be without *us;* and if the water be alone, the people begin to be without Christ."† And others speak of water mingled with wine, being used, because when our Saviour's side was pierced with the spear, there came forth blood and water. To this we must add the "kiss of peace," founded upon the apostolical precept, "greet one another with a holy kiss"; and the washing of the hands before consecration, which was a symbol that we should, before communion, be free from sin, according to the saying of David: "I will wash my hands in innocency, O Lord, and so will I compass thine altar." And lastly we

* Gregor. Sacram. De Baptism. Infant. &c.

† Cyprian, Ep. 63 ad Cæcilium, p. 153.

may advert to the general sign, as in the first sacrament, so in this—the cross. The priest in consecration invariably made this sign, as S. Chrysostom says, "it was not only used by Christians every day, but particularly at the holy table, and in the ordination of priests, and that its glory shone with the body of Christ in the mystical supper."*

Such appear, upon the whole, to be the principal ceremonial rites used in the ancient Church in regard to the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper. In marriage there were ceremonies of a peculiar character, such as giving and receiving a ring, joining of hands, crowning the bride with chaplets of flowers, and the like; and the method of burying the dead also was remarkable for ceremonies very much akin to those still remaining among ourselves; but into these we need not at present enter. Sufficient has been said to show that from the time of Scripture, all through the formation of the Churches in different countries, ceremonial rites did prevail; and those not only within the strict letter of the Gospel, but, also many in addition, spiritually emblematic of holy lessons of love and charity, resting on the authority of the Church.

But let us now approach more modern times. Let us suppose that we are satisfied, from what has been already advanced, of the *principle* that *some* ceremonial observances may be right and useful. This may easily be done. But it is not so easy to be satisfied as to the exact line beyond which ceremonies become burdensome, or lead to superstition, instead of fulfilling their purpose of increasing devotion. To find this line and define it, is the business, according to our twentieth Article, of every national Church. To restrain as well as to command the public observances of divine worship,—to regulate them, to modify them, and sometimes to abolish them, according as it may be thought conducive to the spiritual welfare of her people,—is strictly within the authority of any Church of

* S. Chrysostom, Demonstrat. quod Christus sit Deus, cap. ix, tom. v, p. 840.

Christ coming from the Apostles.* It may very easily be imagined how the simple ceremonies of the primitive Churches mentioned above, should have become corrupt in the advance of ages, through the enthusiasm or the ignorance of men. The steps from one addition to another would be so gentle and so slow, that they would not be immediately perceived; although in lapse of time all these together would amount to very perceptible perversions. And such we find to be the case in the history of the

* Our Articles most distinctly assert both the possibility of a Church being in error in the matter of ceremonies, and the right of a Church to alter and amend them. The nineteenth Article says: "As the Church of Jerusalem.....so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their manner of living and ceremonies." And the twentieth Article says: "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies." And in the twenty-fourth Article again, the assertion of ceremonies not being of necessity alike in every national Church is very plain: "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly alike, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners,—so that nothing be ordained against God's word." It is by no means to follow that unity is broken by diversities of ceremonies. By heresy it is broken,—by errors in *faith* it is broken; but not by variety of customs. Thus Bingham speaks, giving the opinion of the ancient Fathers:

"It is equally clear, that there was no necessity, in order to maintain the unity of the Catholick Church, that all Churches should agree in all the same rites or ceremonies; but every Church might enjoy her own usages and customs, having liberty to prescribe for herself in all things of an indifferent nature, except where either an universal tradition or the decree of some general or national council (as has been noted before) intervened to make it otherwise..... Let us, therefore, maintain one faith throughout the whole Church, wherever it is spread, as intrinsically to the members of the body, although the unity of faith be kept with some different observations, which in no ways hinder or impair the truth of it. For all the beauty of the king's daughter is within, and those observations which are differently celebrated are understood only to be in her outward clothing. Whence she is said to be clothed in golden fringes wrought about with divers colours. But let that clothing be so distinguished by different observations, as that she herself may not be destroyed by *oppositions and contentions about them.* This was the ancient way of preserving peace in the Catholick Church: to let different Churches, which had no dependance in externals upon one another, enjoy their own liberty to follow their own customs without contradiction."—*Bingham*, book xvi, c. i, § 15.

Church, as she advanced from the purity of the primitive ages into the darkness and corruptions of after-times. Ceremonies multiplied in intricacy, number, and superstition, until nearly the whole of the spiritual character of the Gospel was lost. All the care and attention of the Church seemed to be occupied in outward pomp and burdensome usages, whose signification was little less than idolatry, while the inward religion and moral character of men became, in proportion, and as it would seem in consequence, depreciated; and so the middle ages present us with a character (with, of course, many exceptions in individual saints), of gross licentiousness and barbarism, of which now we shudder to read.

In this state of things, the Anglican Church, as a Church, exercised her right of revising these ceremonies; and while she reformed her doctrines, she at the same time, knowing that ceremonies and doctrines always go together, reformed those corrupt usages which had been introduced in corrupt times. Thus then the Preface now under consideration goes on to speak:

> Some are put away, because the great excess and multitude of them hath so increased in these latter days, that the burden of them was intolerable; whereof S. Augustine in his time complained, that they were grown to such a number, that the estate of Christian people was in worse case concerning that matter than were the Jews. And he counselled that such yoke and burden should be taken away, as times would serve quietly to do it. But what would S. Augustin have said, if he had seen the Ceremonies of late days used among us, whereunto the multitude used in his time was not to be compared? This our excessive multitude of Ceremonies was so great, and many of them so dark, that they did more confound and darken, than declare and set forth Christ's benefits unto us. And besides this, Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial Law (as much of Moses' law was), but it is a religion to serve *God*, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit; being content only with those Ceremonies which do serve to a decent order and godly discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified. Furthermore, the most weighty cause of the abolishment of certain Ceremonies was, that they were so far abused, partly by the superstitious blindness of the rude and unlearned, and partly by the unsatiable avarice of such as sought more their own lucre than the glory of God, that the abuses could not well be taken away, the thing remaining still.

The chief of the ceremonies here alluded to, and which had gradually been introduced under the dominion of the Church of Rome, would be these: the reservation and sale of relics: processions in honour of them: the pretended performance of miracles wrought by them, and the falling down in prayer and adoration before them: the burning of tapers before shrines and images of the Saints, and making votive offerings to them: the use of sackcloth and ashes in time of Lent, with similar austere outward mortifications, done too often for display: the use of holy water as a superstitious charm: the too great and too frequent signing of the cross on different parts of the body: the counting of beads in prayer: the knocking upon the breast in time of public worship: the burning of incense as a part of the service of God; the consecration and adoration of crosses and crucifixes, not as memorials, but, esteemed by the ignorant, objects of divine worship; the great number of processions continually parading the streets, in honour of saints; the carrying about the host from place to place: the elevation of the consecrated wafer before the people, and their falling down to worship it.*

* In a paper in the Cotton Library, extracted by Collier in his History of the Church, there is a full account of the ceremonies which were in use at the first opening of the Reformation. The date of this paper will be about the year 1543, at the time of the first publication of the books which set forth the Reformed faith,—namely, "The Institution of a Christian Man," and "The Erudition of a Christian Man," &c. The paper is headed thus:

Ceremonies to be used in the Church of England, together with an explanation of the meaning and significancy of them.

It speaks first of the Church: how it is to be sanctified, washed, and prepared with prayers. The churchyard: to be sanctified and hallowed. Of baptism: the priest to make a cross on the forehead, and again on the breast; to put salt into the mouth of the baptised; to wet with spittle the nose-thurles [nostrils] of the baptized; to anoint the child with holy oil on the breast, and betwixt the shoulders behind, and, after baptism, again on the head; to give to him a white garment; to put a candle in the right hand, &c. &c. In the mass, after describing the vestures, and the course of the service, the ceremonies were: the washing of hands, mixing water with wine, making a cross upon the altar, taking the bread into the priest's hands and giving thanks—upon which it is said, "*by virtue and power of whose*

Such were the ceremonies which our Reformers considered to be objectionable, either in themselves, altogether, or in the extent to which they were carried, and which, therefore, our bishops and Church thought it right either to set aside or modify. But they did not repudiate them at once, but gradually, for indeed there was a great fondness for ceremonial show in the hearts of the people of those days. The lower orders especially loved them, and would by no means part from them. Gradually and with a gentle hand they were purged away and set aside. And in this way we may account for a considerable difference in the ceremonies now authorized, and those authorized in king Edward's first Book. Whether the first book of Edward be preferable to our present book as to this matter, may be a question. Certainly, many of the ceremonies permitted in the former, and rejected in the latter, are of primitive antiquity, and might have remained with great benefit to the Church; but as in no case were they *essential*, and as we cheerfully subscribe to the doctrine that the Church has the right to alter ceremonies, so our duty now is cheerfully to submit. Some may regret that loss of ceremonial observance which we suffered in the second book, while others may think that too much is even now retained. It will be time to question whether we have suffered *any loss*, when we perform sincerely all that *we still possess*.

The following are the principal ceremonies commanded in king Edward's first book, but afterwards omitted. In

words, the substance of bread is turned into the substance of the body of Christ." Bells are ordered, to call the ministers and people to prayer. Candles are to be borne on Candlemas-day. The priests are to wear tonsures on the head. Ashes are to be given on Ash Wednesday. The crosses and images are to be covered in Lent. Palms are to be borne on Palm Sunday. On the Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in Passion week, candles are to be lighted at every psalm and lesson, and then put out, signifying the world in darkness before the coming of Christ. On Shier Thursday [Maundy Thursday] oil and chrism were to be consecrated. On Good Friday, creeping to the cross was ordered, to signify humility. The image of the cross and the blessed sacrament were laid in the sepulchre. On Easter Even the font is to be hallowed. Holy water and holy bread were to be always kept in the church, the one to put us in mind of baptism, the other of unity as one bread, &c. &c. All this may be found at greater length in Collier, pt. ii, bk. iii.

baptism, the infant was anointed with oil, as well as immersed in water. The infant was to be immersed *three* times, not once. In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, water was to be mixed with wine. In the consecration prayer, the sign of the cross was to be made at the moment of consecrating the elements. The bread was to be unleavened and round. In confirmation, the bishop was to sign the forehead of the person confirmed with the cross, as well as to lay hands on him. In the prayers for the sick, the priest was to anoint the sick man on the forehead and the breast. In marriage, besides the giving of the ring, jewels, and bracelets were to be given. At the period of death, earth was to be cast upon the corpse, and the priest was to recommend the soul of the dead unto God. Besides which, the frequent signing of the cross was allowed, and knocking of the breast in prayer, with other similar outward manifestations of grief or faith.

But all these are now, as we all know, abolished. In the Prayer Book, as it now stands, the only ceremonies allowed are the following: In the sacrament of baptism, the sign of the cross on the forehead of the person baptized, and the taking of the infant into the arms of the priest, to represent our Lord taking the little children up in His arms. In the sacrament of the eucharist, the offering of "the alms" of the congregation on the altar, and the offering of the "oblations," (in which are contained the bread and wine,) to represent the offering up Christ in memory. In the prayer of consecration, the taking of the paten into the hands of the priest, and the breaking of the bread before the people, to represent Christ's body taken up, nailed to the cross, and broken for the sins of the people, after the example of Christ Himself, who, when "He had given thanks, took bread and brake it." Also the laying on of hands upon the bread, in token of blessing and consecration. Also in regard to the chalice, the taking it up into the priest's hands, after the manner of Christ, who "took the cup"; and the laying on of hands upon every chalice or flagon, as upon the bread, in token of blessing and consecration. In addition to the observances in the administration of the holy sacraments, we have: in confirmation,

the laying on of hands; in ordination also, the laying on of hands, coupled, in that of priests and bishops, with the delivery of THE BIBLE into their hands; in marriage, we have the joining of hands, and the giving of a ring; and in the burial service, the casting of earth upon the body, when consigned to the grave. Further than these, I do not think that there are any ceremonial actions commanded in our Prayer Book, or directed by our canons. There are indeed many rubrical directions which refer to minor points, and there are also many ceremonies still existing, and which have always existed in the Church, not mentioned either way, but resting solely upon tradition,—such as doing reverence in churches by taking off the hat on the part of men, and on the part of women by remaining covered, according to the apostle's precept. Bowing before the altar is mentioned in the canons of 1640 as a thing permitted, though not advised, and to be done with charity. Turning to the East in prayer, and particularly in reciting the Creed, is also a ceremony very much used among devout Christians, neither forbidden, nor yet commanded. Decoration of churches at certain seasons with evergreens and flowers, is another traditional custom, conveying much meaning under a simple emblematic representation. All these are usages still surviving, and generally practised; and to these no doubt many others of a local character might be added in various parts of the country, and which many a person will readily remember as forming part of his religious associations in his native town or village.

Such then are the authorized ceremonial observances of the English Church. But pure and simple as they are, they have not been without objectors, nor indeed are they so at present, whenever an attempt is made faithfully to observe them. As it was difficult on one side to reconcile the minds of good Catholics to the loss of many of their former usages, so it was difficult on the other side to reconcile the Puritans, and others of a sectarian spirit, even to the very few that remained. The Reformers had to deal with enemies on each side; and therefore it is that they speak, as in a former quotation, so now, again:

> But now as concerning those persons, which peradventure will be

offended, for that some of the old ceremonies are retained still: If they consider that without some ceremonies it is not possible to keep any order, or quiet discipline in the Church, they shall easily perceive just cause to reform their judgements. And if they think much, that any of the old do remain, and would rather have all devised anew: then such men granting some ceremonies convenient to be had, surely where the old may be well used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old only for their age, without bewraying of their own folly. For in such a case they ought rather to have reverence unto them for their antiquity, if they will declare themselves to be more studious of unity and concord, than of innovations and new-fangleness, which (as much as may be with true setting forth of Christ's religion) is always to be eschewed. Furthermore, such shall have no just cause with the ceremonies reserved to be offended. For as those be taken away which were most abused, and did burden men's consciences without any cause: so the other that remain are retained for discipline and order, which (upon just causes) may be altered and changed, and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with God's law. And moreover, they be neither dark nor dumb ceremonies, but are so set forth, that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve. So that it is not like that they in time to come should be abused as other have been. And in these our doings we condemn no other nations, nor prescribe anything but to our own people only: for we think it convenient that every country should use such ceremonies as they shall think best to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition: and that they should put away other things, which from time to time they perceive to be most abused, as in men's ordinances it often chanceth diversely in divers countries.

Surely no language could be more moderate than this. Persons of extreme opinions there ever will be in the Church, and to satisfy such persons, every endeavour will be vain. The safe way is to take the middle path, and to give no heed to the gainsayers on which ever side they be. It is the common cry now, as it was in the days when Puritanism was triumphant, that ceremonial observances are Popish. Examine this cry honestly, and to what will it come. It will come to this, that because one thing is *like* another, therefore it is the *same*.* Hooker, in describing

* At the Hampton Court Conference, in the reign of James I, the arguments of the opponents of the Prayer Book took their course principally from the similitude that existed between the Mass-Book (so called) and the Prayer Book.

"Dr. Reynolds objected the instance of the brazen serpent beaten

the Puritans of his day, speaks as though he were living now. How exactly the description which he gives of the clamour and party spirit of the sixteenth century, tallies with that which now so unhappily prevails among us. He is describing the strange perversions of truth by which the multitude was misled: "*The Church of England* (say the Puritans) *is fraught with popish ceremonies. They that favour the cause of the Reformation, maintain nothing but the sincerity of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. All such as withstand them fight for the laws of his sworn enemy, uphold the filthy relics of Antichrist, and are defenders of that which is popish.* These are the notes wherewith are drawn from the hearts of the multitude so many sighs. With these tunes their minds are exasperated against the lawful guides and governors of their souls." The argument is—because the Papists have *superstitious* ceremonies—therefore we must have *no* ceremonies; that is *evils must be cured by contrary evils.* You find an evil in the Church of Rome, and then set to work to cure it, by finding its extreme opposite. On which Hooker again observes: "We are con-

to powder by Hezekiah, because it had been abused to idolatry. By parity of reasoning, he conceived the use of the cross should be suppressed, because it had been carried to a superstitious excess in times of Popery. 'I have lived,' said king James, 'among these men ever since I was ten years old, and nothing has given me a stronger aversion for their system than their peremptory disapproving every thing used by the Papists. This way of reasoning I detest. For my part, I know no way of avoiding the charge of novelty brought by the Papists, but by answering, that we retain the primitive use of things, and only stand off from the innovations brought in by themselves. But Dr. Reynolds' argument would bring us to renounce the Trinity, and many other fundamental parts of belief, because they are common to us and the Papists. Dr. Reynolds,' said the king, with an air of pleasantry, '*they used to wear shoes and stockings in times of Popery,—have you therefore a mind to go barefoot?*'"—*Collier*, book viii, part ii.

But, to go to graver arguments. Let us see what Hooker says:—

"Let the Church of Rome be what it will,—let them that are of it be the people of God, and our fathers in the Christian faith, or let them be otherwise,—hold them for Catholics, or hold them for heretics,—it is not a thing either one way or other, in the present question, greatly material. Our conformity with them in such things as have been proposed is not proved as yet unlawful by all this. S.

trariwise of opinion, that he which will perfectly recover a sick, and restore a diseased, body to health, must not endeavour so much to bring it to a state of simple contrariety, as of fit *proportion* in contrariety unto those evils which are to be cured. He that will take away extreme heat, by setting the body in extremity of cold, shall undoubtedly remove the disease, but together with it the diseased too." It is said that we must not turn to the east in prayer, *because the Church of Rome does so;* we must not use a surplice in Divine Service, particularly in preaching, *because the Church of Rome does so;* we must not anoint persons baptised, with oil, *because the Church of Rome does so.* Now there may be many good reasons why we should, or why we should not, do these things; but if that *only* be reason, then we must not use the sacrament of baptism with water in the name of the Holy Trinity; we must not administer the sacrament of the Lord's supper; we must not pray; we must not preach; *because the Church of Rome does so.* Nothing surely can be so utterly devoid of reason as such assertions as these. They carry with them their own re-

Augustine hath said, 'yea, and we have allowed his saying, that the custom of the people of God, and the decrees of our forefathers, are to be kept, touching those things whereof the Scripture hath neither one way or other given us any charge. What then? Doth it here therefore follow that they, being neither the people of God nor our forefathers, are for that cause in nothing to be followed? This consequence were good, if so be it were granted that only the custom of the people of God, and the decrees of our forefathers, are in such case to be observed But then, should no other kind of latter laws in the Church be good?—which were a gross absurdity to think.' S. Augustine's speech therefore doth impart, that where we have no divine precept, if yet we have the custom of the people of God, or a decree of our forefathers, this is a law, and must be kept. Notwithstanding, it is not denied but that we lawfully may observe the positive constitutions of our own Churches, although the same were but yesterday made by ourselves alone. Nor is there anything in this to prove that the Church of England might not by law receive orders, rites or customs, from the Church of Rome, although they were neither the people of God nor yet our forefathers. How much less, when we have received from them nothing but that which they did themselves receive from such as we cannot deny to have been the people of God. Yea, such as either we must acknowledge for our own forefathers, or else disdain the race of Christ."—*Hooker, Eccl. Pol.* book iv. § 5.

futation. We can surely separate what is corrupt from what is good; retain the good, and throw away the corrupt. As the Preface says: "Surely where the old may be well used, there men cannot reprove the old *only for their age* without bewraying of their own folly."*

* Nothing has so much hindered the progress of the Church of England in recovering a true Catholic and primitive tone of devotion, as this fear about Rome. It has prevailed on all sides, and in every age, since the Reformation. It is, we may presume, sincerely urged by some; but by many, who are Dissenters at heart, it is *hypocritically* used; while again by the Papists themselves, and specially the Jesuits, it has ever been made the means of sowing dissension among us, in order that they may weaken us. We trace it in the *Directory*,—the Act for Public Prayer, which abolished the liturgy of the Church,—and we trace it in every outcry of the present day about surplices and crosses, and the like, with which ignorant or designing men are filling the world.

"Howbeit, long and sad experience hath made it manifest, that the Liturgy used in the Church of England (notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers of it) hath proved an *offence*, not only to many of the godly at home, but also to the Reformed Churches abroad. For, not to speak of urging the reading of all the prayers, which very greatly increased the burden of it, the many unprofitable and burdensome *ceremonies* contained in it have occasioned much mischief, as well as by disquieting the consciences of many godly ministers and people who could not yield unto them, as by depriving them of the ordinances of God, which they might not enjoy without conforming or subscribing to these *ceremonies*. Sundry good Christians have been, by means thereof, kept from the Lord's table, and divers able and faithful ministers debarred from the exercises of their ministry (to the endangering many thousand souls, in a time of such scarcity of faithful pastors), and spoiled of their livelyhood, to the undoing of them and their families."

And again:

"In the mean, since Papists boasted that the Book was a compliance with them in a great part of their service, and so were not a little confirmed in their superstition and idolatry, expecting rather *our return to them*, than endeavouring the reformation of themselves. In which expectation they were of late very much encouraged, when, upon the pretended warrantableness of imposing of the former ceremonies, new ones were daily obtruded upon the Church."—Directory for Public Prayer, anno 1645.

There is an anecdote in Heylin's Life of Laud, where the same thing is mentioned; and very remarkably, the same phrase which now prevails among us, of "*innovations, innovations*," is reiterated as the watchword of alarm, quite forgetting that where neglect and omission have been for some time the character of a lax Church, and

And now I would conclude with one or two practical reflections. It is obvious that the ceremonial rites of our Church are principally in the hands of the clergy. In their method of performing divine service, as bishops, priests, and deacons; in their administration of the holy sacraments, and their conduct and reverential aspect in time of prayer and preaching; in their due obedience to the Rubrics by which those ceremonial rites are directed, all these matters devolve upon *them*, and if they are negligent of them, or disobedient to them, it is at their risk and peril, as the sworn servants of the Church. But at the same time, there are many things in these ceremonial rites which devolve upon the *laity*. The laity, or people, in every parish, have much, very much, in their power, either to hinder or to forward the devotional aspect of our Church services. Much depends on *their willingness to abide by what is pointed out to them;* much depends on their ready mind to give up prejudices, long fostered by an age of carelessness in divine

revival of discipline takes place, *there must be an appearance of novelty*; but *renovation* is not *innovation*.

"For the removing of those rubs, he (Archbishop Laud) fell upon the courses before mentioned; which being *renovations* only of some ancient usages, were branded by the odious name of *innovations*, by *some of those who out of cunning and design, had long disused them*. Some zealous Protestants beheld his actings with no small fear, as biassing too strongly towards Rome: the Puritans exclaimed against him for a Papist, and the Papists cried him up for theirs, and gave themselves some flattering hopes of our coming towards them. But the most knowing and understanding men amongst them found plainly that nothing could tend more to their destruction than the introducing some ceremonies which by late negligence and practice had been discontinued. For I have heard from a person of known nobility, that at his being at Rome with a father of the English College, one of the novices came in, and told him with a great deal of joy that the English were returning to the Church of Rome; that they began to set up altars, to officiate in their copes, to adorn their churches, and to paint the pictures of the saints in the church windows. To which the old father made reply with some indignation, that he talked like some ignorant novice; that these proceedings rather tended to the ruin than to the advancement of the Catholic cause; that by this means the Church of England, coming nearer to the ancient usages, *the Catholics there would sooner be drawn off from them, than any more of that nation would fall off to Rome*".—Heylin, *Life of Archbishop Laud*, p. 391.

things; much depends upon their honest determination to reflect upon the reality of things, and to think for themselves, without bias from the misrepresentations of designing and discontented men; men who pervert the truth for the sake of party spirit. The impediments or the encouragements given to the clergy by their people are thus of infinite importance.

But even independently of this, there is much to be done by the laity,—more immediately. For instance, *postures of body* in divine service; the way we sit, or stand, or kneel, in certain portions of the service are, strictly speaking, *ceremonies*. Silence and attention at one time; at another, speaking aloud, in responding and singing;—all these devolve upon the LAITY; and upon their due observance of these matters, the beauty and harmony of our liturgy very much depend.

The postures of body in divine service are of three sorts: *Kneeling*, which belongs to prayer and supplication: *Standing*, which belongs to praise, and listening to the liturgical addresses of the clergy: *Sitting*, which is *permitted*, though never commanded in the Prayer Book, yet permitted during the time of reading the lessons and preaching the sermon. But how many of us neglect these simple rules! How many sit during prayer, or, worse than that,—throw themselves into all sorts of idle and negligent postures, as though their minds were totally unaffected by the duties in which they are engaged. How many, again, in the psalmody, and in the responses, never rise from their seats, or join with their voices in the portion appointed for them. How many, again, in the doxologies, specially in the doxology after sermon, do not rise to give glory to God, but remain sitting: I mean in the doxology which commences with the words: "*Now to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost.*" This is a *doxology*,—a giving glory to the ever-blessed Trinity. The sermon is then concluded; and the people, according to ancient practice, ought to stand, as giving, at the invitation of the preacher, glory to God. The words themselves manifest this, if attention is paid to them: "*Now* to God the Father;" the word "NOW" arresting their

attention, and calling upon them to join with the preacher in his praise of God.

Again, at the mention of the name of JESUS, particularly in the Creed, how many never bow the head or the knee, —an ancient Church ceremony,—a *Scripture* ceremony,— signifying our faith in the divinity of Him who came among us *a Saviour*,—God and man,—though man, yet God. But of all these, the principal neglect which I should mention (because it is so *obvious*) is the absence of kneeling in prayer. *Moses*, when interceding for the ungrateful Israelites, bowed his head, and worshipped. *Solomon* "kneeled down upon his knees before all the congregation of Israel." *Ezra* "fell upon his knees, and spread out his hands to the Lord his God." *Daniel* kneeled "upon his knees three times a day." *Stephen*, the first martyr, kneeled down and prayed. And last of all, our great Redeemer Himself, as man, in His agony in the garden, "*fell on His face, and kneeled down and prayed.*" Surely then, for one of us,—for sinful wretched creatures such as *we*,—for US to presume to address God in a *sitting* posture, is the very height of irreverence. Where can the *mind* be, if the body thus represents it? How can our *hearts* be occupied in prayer, if all tone and symbol of prayer is lost in an irreverential attitude, as though we were speaking to an equal, or commanding a servant, instead of speaking to the living God? Surely the very slightest reflection would cure *this* irreverence.

The laity have most clearly a right to demand of their clergy a faithful adherence to their ceremonial duties. But at the same time the clergy have a counter-right to request of the people a strict adherence on *their* part to such ceremonial observances as fall within their compass. The priest must ask the people for their co-operation in the good work of divine service, to help *his* devotion by *their* devotion, to show him that they appreciate what is said and what is done, and that they understand the duty in which they are engaged, by following the order of the service in the method pointed out. So indeed, and so only, shall the priest and people be a congregation united in sentiment and in heart. So shall they be a Church at

peace within herself; not stopping short in these ceremonial things, and going no further than this outward part, (God forbid!) but making them the symbols and the signs of order in the mind; making them the beginning and foundation of correctness in moral behaviour; of piety in the heart, of devotion to God, of holiness, of charity, of faith. Let us be steadily bent upon improving the great privileges which God in His mercy has conferred upon us as a Church. Let us carefully display to Him, by attention even in the minutest things of His worship, that we love Him,—that we are ever thinking of Him,—that nothing is too dear for Him, nothing too little, nothing too great; that we are striving in all things to show our jealousy for His glory, and our zeal for His honour. Though these outward things are, after all, but the preliminaries, but the gates and porticoes of the Temple, still it is through these gates and porticoes that the Temple must of necessity be entered. If we differ at the entrance, how shall we agree together in that vast fabric of doctrine and mystery which is afterwards to be developed? Different Churches, as we have already shown, and our Articles prove, may have different customs; but certainly in the *same* Church,—I should say, the same *congregation*,—the ceremonies ought to be the same. Suffer it then to be so *with us*. Let us be as the strings of the harp of David; all may be of different notes, but, being struck together by one hand, they shall make one harmony of chord. "How good and joyful a thing it is, to dwell together in unity. It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even unto Aaron's beard, and went down to the skirts of his clothing. Like as the dew of Hermon, which fell upon the hill of Sion, for there the Lord promised his blessing and life for evermore."

SERMON VII.

THE FEASTS OF THE CHURCH.

LEVITICUS xxiii. 4.

"*These are the feasts of the Lord, even holy convocations which ye shall proclaim in their seasons.*"

WHEN GOD created the universe, and formed it out of nothing into its present shape and order, one of its most conspicuous and beautiful parts was—*the division of time.* All things were so directed as to be continually flowing on in one undeviating circle; yet all things in that circle had their allotted space, and were not permitted to continue in one stay. Human life was *measured.* It was not an indiscriminate passage from one point to another, but it was marked by stages: infancy, boyhood, manhood, old age. The earth and its produce were *measured.* It was not one universal summer, or one universal winter, having all things alike, without shade or diversity; but it was season succeeding season, light succeeding darkness, heat succeeding cold; so that the earth was ever changing, and the green fields and verdant trees of spring and summer alternated with the fruit-bearing autumn, and the cold barrenness of rugged winter. And thus it is described in the first chapter of the book of Genesis: "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven, to divide the day from the night, and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and years."

Now religion and the Church ever work according to the analogy of nature. All that is ever seen in the world,—whether it be spiritual, as religion, or temporal, as the ma-

terial universe,—bears marks of having proceeded from the same great hand: it is God that originates both. And so it is that in our most holy faith, and in the Church which is built upon it, we ever find one marked characteristic to be—*the division of the seasons.* The temporal year begins with its appointed months, and passes through its seasons ever recurring. The religious year has also its weeks and days, its times and seasons ever recurring, marking to the heart of man his duties and his sins, his joys and his dangers. It is well thus to think how the Church and God's other works harmonize. If it were not so, religion would not be what it is,—adapted to the world in which we live. But now it is singularly so; and our Book of Common Prayer, falling in with the analogy of nature, prepares all things for us with this view. It takes up the months and days as onwards from hour to hour they pass. It takes up the Holy Bible, and divides it according to those months and days, so that we shall not miss any of its exhortations or its warnings. Matins and even-song bring round their lessons and their psalms duly fixed for reading; morning and evening tell off the passing hours from day to day. The Bible and the Psalter stand side by side with time. They equally and jointly say: "Work on your course, O children of a passing journey,—pilgrims and sojourners upon the earth. Reflect, repent, pray. Spend not too much care on that which perisheth. Take no thought for to-morrow, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed; but take thought for to-morrow, *how ye stand with God.* Now is the day; but work on your course in stedfastness and patience, 'for the night cometh when no man can work'."

All this,—namely, the ordinary progress of time from evensong to matins, day by day,—is marked out to us in our Prayer Book by its ordinary monthly calendar, and it has already been considered in the daily service. But not only is this monthly calendar placed for our direction in the division of time from night to day,—but there is still further beauty in our Prayer Book,—still further analogy with nature; for, as nature brings down upon us at times her dark and lowering days, her days of gloom and severity,

when the heart of man is made sorry and vexed within him ;—and as again at other times she brightens up into days of sunshine and of a gleaming atmosphere, and the works of God seem to smile upon us, with happiness which they cannot contain; even so the Church—she too has her gloomy times of penitence and mourning, when she desires to make man's heart downcast with the remembrance of sin, and all things about her speak of woe; and yet withal at other times she puts aside her mourning garments, decks herself with glittering robes, and comes forth as a bridegroom out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a giant to run his course, and bids us be of good cheer, for in Christ there is deliverance, and with the Lord there is plenteous redemption. And so she smiles, and is joyful with her children, and speaks of gladness.

This coincidence between the Church, as speaking in our Prayer Book, and nature, you will notice in the several tables of the fasts and festivals which occur next after the monthly calendar. And with these our division of time is full and complete; not the same always, but ever-varying, as time varies: speaking to all at different seasons in different ways, even as God speaks to all in different ways,—now by success and prosperity, and now by misfortune and sorrow.

Let us first consider the doctrine of the *Festival Seasons*, according as they are set forth in our Prayer Book, showing their Scriptural authority, and the reasons of their celebration.

The holding of anniversary days for festivity and rejoicing is by no means peculiar to the revealed religion of God. It would appear a practice equally belonging to heathens in all ages. Either for political or religious purposes, either for days of rest from labour, or for the purpose of celebrating triumphs over enemies, or for the purpose of promoting both mental and bodily exercises among the people, —the ancient world of Greece and Rome was notorious for its observance of days of festivity. In the history of the Athenians we are continually hearing of the Artemesia, a feast in honour of their goddess Diana; the Dionysia, in honour of Bacchus; the Eleusinia, in honour of Ceres;

and the Panathenæa, in honour of Minerva. While in ancient Rome, the Matronalia, Cerealia, Saturnalia (which latter has become a by-word in common conversation), are well known to all classical readers. The Mohamedans also have their Feast of Victims, celebrated in the last month of their year; as well as their feast of Bairam, and others. Now it would not be right to say, as some persons have said, that the fact of this universal prevalence of festival days among the heathens is an argument against their customary observance among Christians. Because in all matters of religious usage prevailing in the Gentile world, there is no doubt whatever but that they were derived by tradition from the Jewish people. The doctrine of sacrifice was ever connected with the doctrine of festivals, and there can be no question but that the sacrifices of the heathens, though in the course of time they became grossly corrupt, were, notwithstanding all this, originally derived from some intermixture with, or observance of, the rites of the Israelites. It may be safely said that this general prevalence of holy days,—days of solemnity and rejoicing, as well as days of fasting and woe,—is to be derived from that one common source whence all good things either directly or indirectly proceed, namely, the revelation of God.

But let us advert at once to the Holy Scriptures. What intimation do we there find for the observance of days? In the first place, we find the *weekly* feast of the Sabbath, to commemorate the works of the creation. (*Gen.* ii, 3). And we also find these *annual* feasts: 1. The Passover, in memory of the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt. (*Exod.* xii, 14.) 2. The Feast of Pentecost, fifty days after the passover, to commemorate the delivery of the law to Moses on Mount Sinai, called sometimes by the Hebrews the feast of Weeks. (*Deut.* xvi, 10.) 3. The feast of Trumpets, to commemorate the beginning of the year. (*Levit.* xxiii, 23.) And 4. The feast of Tabernacles, to commemorate the dwelling in tents in the wilderness. (*Deut.* xvi, 13.) On three of these feasts every male was "*to appear before the Lord*,"—namely, "in the feast of unleavened bread, in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of Tabernacles." In addition to these annual feasts, we find

the septennial feast called "the Sabbatical Year," set apart for rest, with many peculiar customs (*Levit.* xxv, 2); and at the end of every seven times seventh year, or forty-ninth, we find the Year of Jubilee. (*Levit.* xxv, 10.) In this year there was no sowing or reaping. Every man resumed his inheritance, and slaves were set free. Again, in addition to the above, which were strictly feasts commanded by God Himself, we find the feast of Lots or Purim, by which was commemorated the delivery of the Jews from Haman under Esther (*Esther* iii, 7); and the feast of Dedication (Encœnia), 1 *Macc.* iv, 52, and mentioned in *John* x, 22, by which was commemorated the restoration of the Temple after its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes. These two latter days are not of divine appointment, but rest only on the authority of the Jewish Church.

It is easy then to see how plentifully the Jewish revelation sets forth this religious duty as a principle of God's will; and we have nothing to do but turn to the pages of the New Testament, in order to see by our Lord's example how He sanctioned its transference to the covenant of the Gospel. His observance of the Passover, both as a child, and also when He had assumed the office of Messiah, is very remarkable. In S. Luke we are told, that "His parents went to Jerusalem *every year*, at the feast of the Passover. And when He was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem, after the custom of the feast." In S. John we find the same thing spoken of as a matter of course, in times further advanced: "When he was at Jerusalem, at the Passover." And it is needless to say that it was *at the Passover* that He became our sacrifice and atonement for sin, first instituting a feast for Christians in its place, and then by dying, becoming its fulfilment and antitype. But He was also at the feast of tabernacles (*John* vii, 2), and at the feast of Dedication. (*John* x, 22.) And when the Evangelists record these things of Him, they do not remark that He did them for the sake of the Jews only,—that He did them merely as a son of Abraham,—but they record them as facts testifying to His religious character generally. We may assume as a general rule for the interpretation of Scripture in those cases of duty

where there is a transference from the Old Covenant to the New, that where nothing is said as changing the principle of obligation, there it remains as of force for ever. For instance, circumcision is not of Christian obligation, because it was specifically abrogated. But the observance of festival days, such as the Sabbath and others, continues of obligation, because it is not abrogated. Its transference has been made by the tacit consent of our Lord and His apostles. In other words, if our blessed Lord had willed that such observances as those of festival days should be put aside in Christianity, He would have revealed that will. Not having revealed such to be His will, we assume that the principle established in the Law is to be continued in the Gospel.

But objections may be raised by those who do not see the Scriptures in the light I have now placed them, or by those who confine their view to one or two solitary texts, to the neglect of the rest—objections as to the *source* of the appointment of the days in question. "The Jewish days (some might say) were expressly of God's own command; but the Christian days are not so. Or, even a little further. We will allow such times as Easter, and Whitsuntide, and Christmas; but we object to festival days of saints and martyrs." It may be confessed that there *is* a difference in the days in question,—a great difference; but the difference arises from the nature of the commemoration, not from the authority of their appointment. None of the days of festival observance in the Church are of divine appointment,—not even the Lord's day, *as* the Lord's day, They are all of *Church* appointment. The Sabbath day is indeed of divine obligation; but there is no place in Scripture which directly authorizes the substitution of the first day of the week for the seventh. *Indirectly* Christianity does this, but only *indirectly*. From the Apostles' *practice*, and from the facts which we read of in the early history of the Church, we do find that a change of day took place, but we nowhere find that it was appointed directly by God. If then the Church had power in one instance,—and this instance is acknowledged,—why should it not have the power in other in-

stances? It had this power; and the facts are clear. The Lord's day took the place of the Sabbath, and this was quickly followed by Easter Day taking the place of the Passover,—by Whit Sunday taking the place of Pentecost; and then, in the place of such festivals of commemoration as the *Dedication* and the *Purim* to the Jew, would be the commemoration of the apostles, saints and martyrs, to the Christian.

Now we find that in very early times,—so early indeed as the middle of the second century,—festival days were appointed to commemorate the saints and martyrs. The memory of martyrs seems, in the Primitive Church, to have been a motive to peculiar religious devotion. The day on which the anniversary of a martyr was kept, was called his birthday; and it was celebrated, not as a day of mourning, but one of joy and thankfulness. The day of his death in the present world was, as it were, his day of birth in the future kingdom of God. "The original of these days," says Bingham, "is at least as early as the time of Polycarp, who suffered about the year 168." S. Polycarp was a disciple of S. John, and bishop of Smyrna. It is recorded by Eusebius that after his death the Christians of his Church met at his tomb, and celebrated his birthday as well for the memory of the sufferer, as for example to all posterity. Tertullian also speaks of these anniversary festivals. S. Cyprian also speaks of them; and S. Chrysostom remarks that these days occurred, not once or twice a year, but oftentimes two or three together in a week. On these occasions alms and oblations were offered for the poor; the holy eucharist was celebrated, and panegyrical sermons pronounced in memory of the deceased. In fact, the whole observance of the days partook of the same character as the Lord's day itself, only with the addition of having a specific bearing on the saint commemorated.

Thus then we find the teaching of the Church very ample and very decided as to the observance of days. That which was universally done in such an early period of the Church's history as the middle of the second century, could not but partake of divine authority. The men

of that age had either lived as contemporaries of the Apostles, or if not, they had seen and conversed with apostolic men, and their practice must universally be allowed as of great weight in any argument for religious usages. It is true that in times subsequent, when the ages of corruption had set in, the number of these days so increased that it became a burden to observe them. It is true also that the principle of canonizing holy men produced in the Church many most serious evils; and the calendar of the Romish Breviary makes us acquainted with multitudes of men, who were celebrated for anything rather than holiness of life. I have already alluded, in the fourth sermon, to the legends in which the pages of the Breviary set forth many events and men of at least questionable character; and we are of course ready to allow that in this practice, as in all others, abuses might grow up which would need a pruning and purifying hand. But the abuse of a practice does not furnish any sufficient reason for the abolition of the practice itself. Our Reformers always acted on this principle; and when they found the calendar overloaded with a multitude of days which were not of primitive authority, they set them aside, still retaining such as might be edifying to the Church, as days of instruction and rejoicing.

But it is now time that we look to our Book of Common Prayer, and observe the directions there given. In the first place, we find the *monthly calendar;* and against some of the days, as they occur in order, we find letters of *red*, stating the name of a saint, or some special subject of commemoration. We also find in this calendar letters of *black*, stating other names of saints, and other events. For instance, to take the month of January, we shall find "Circumcision", "Epiphany", and "Conversion of S. Paul", in red letters; but "Lucian P. and M." "Hilary B. and C." "Prisca V. and M." "Fabian B. and M." "Agnes V. and M." "Vincent M." in black letters. The reason is that the red letter days are meant to be days of public religious observance in the Church of England, while those in black letters are days, *not of public observance*, not containing any special service appointed for

them, but yet days on which we might do well to remember and record privately the saints whose names are so printed.*

* Wheatly gives the following account of the retention of these days in our calendar:

"The reasons why the names of these saints'-days and holy-days were resumed into the calendar are various. Some of them being retained upon account of our courts of justice, which usually make their returns on these days, or else upon the days before or after them, which are called in the writs Vigil, Fest, or Crast, as in *Vigil-Martin*, *Fest-Martin*, *Crast-Martin*, and the like. Others are probably kept for the sake of such tradesmen, handicraftsmen, and others, as are wont to celebrate the memory of their tutelar Saints, as the Welshmen do of S. David, and the shoemakers S. Crispin. And again, churches being in several places dedicated to some or other of these Saints, it has been the usual custom in such places to have wakes or fairs kept upon those days, so that the people would probably be displeased, if either in this or the former case their favourite Saint's name should be left out of the calendar. Besides, the histories which were writ before the Reformation do frequently speak of transactions happening upon such a holy-day, or about such a time, without mentioning the month, relating one thing to be done at *Lammas-Tide*, and another about *Martin-Mas*, &c.; so that were these names quite left out, we might be at a loss to know when several of these transactions happened. But for this and the foregoing reasons, our second Reformers under Queen Elizabeth (though all those days had been omitted in both books of King Edward VI, excepting S. George's Day, Lammas Day, S. Lawrence, and S. Clement, which were in his second book) thought convenient to restore the names of them to the calendar, though not with any regard to their being kept holy by the Church."—*Wheatly, Rational Illustration*, &c. chap. i, part ii.

Although, according to this account, the names were retained for a mere temporal purpose, still there can be no impropriety in our turning it to a spiritual use as far as we can, for by learning the histories of the Saints marked in black letters, we shall at least become acquainted with several important periods of the Church's history, and in many instances receive much instruction.—Wheatly himself goes through the calender, and gives a short account of each. It may be as well to note that the letters attached to each name mean as follow:

B, Bishop. M, Martyr. V, Virgin. C, Confessor. A, Archbishop. K, King.

The present manner of printing our calendar in the Book of Common Prayer, is shamefully negligent. In the first place, one whole column is omitted, and that without any authority; and in the next place, the red letter days are no longer distinguished. The first column shows the day of the month as to number. The second column shows the letters of each day, by which we know the Sunday,

Again,—after this monthly calendar is concluded, we find two tables, setting forth special days of rejoicing for the whole year. First, a table to find Easter and the movable Feasts, and then a table setting forth the names of all the other festivals throughout the year.

A Table of all the Feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the Year.

All Sundays in the Year.

The Days of the Feasts of

The Circumcision of our Lord JESUS CHRIST.
The Epiphany.
The Conversion of S. Paul.
The Purification of the Blessed Virgin.
S. Matthias the Apostle.
The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin.
S. Mark the Evangelist.
S. Philip and S. James the Apostles.
The Ascension of our Lord JESUS CHRIST.
S. Barnabas.
The Nativity of S. John Baptist.
S. Peter the Apostle.
S. James the Apostle.
S. Bartholomew the Apostle.
S. Matthew the Apostle.
S. Michael and all Angels.
S. Luke the Evangelist.
S. Simon and S. Jude the Apostles.
All Saints.
S. Andrew the Apostle.
S. Thomas the Apostle.
The NATIVITY of our LORD.
S. Stephen the Martyr.
S. John the Evangelist.
The Holy Innocents.
Monday and Tuesday in Easter Week.
Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun Week.

one of the letters being called the Dominical letter, or Lord's Day letter; and that letter being once found by another table, we know the Sunday throughout the year. The third column, which is now generally omitted, shows the calends, nones, and ides, being the Roman way of calculating the days, and the way in use by the primitive Christians. From the word *calends* is derived the title we give to this register or table—that of CALENDAR.

It will be found, on comparing these two latter tables with the monthly calendar, that there are several days in the former which are not mentioned in the latter. And the reason is, that many festivals of the Church are what is called movable; that is, they depend on the age of the moon, which regulates Easter Day, so that they could not be inserted in the monthly list, which of course is fixed. The movable feasts are given in the first table—Easter, and those which are regulated by Easter; and then follows a table of those feasts which are not movable. We might divide the feasts of the Church of England into three classes. The first class would include the commemoration of great events referring to our Blessed Lord Himself, such as the Nativity, the Circumcision, the Epiphany, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and Whit Sunday. The second class would relate to the Commemoration of the Saints, embracing Saint Mary the Blessed Virgin in two festivals,—namely, the Purification and the Annunciation; together with all the Apostles and Evangelists, S. John the Baptist, and S. Stephen, deacon and protomartyr. The third class would embrace the memory of the holy angels, under S. Michael and the Holy Innocents, and one general commemoration of the saints of all ages and all times, called All Saints' Day. These days are not only set forth in these three different calendars, but there is also another table which appoints lessons and services for each, and for some, particular psalms. And moreover, lest there should be any ambiguity or doubt in the matter,—lest the insertion of these tables and calendars should be construed into a mere permission to use them, as *optional*,—we have the following rubric after the Nicene Creed in the communion service, which *commands* them:

"*Then the curate shall declare unto the people what holy days or fasting days are in the week following to be observed.*"*

* In addition to this, we may observe that the Canons are very peremptory on the subject, stating as follows:

Canon LXIV.—Ministers solemnly to bid Holy Days.

"Every parson, vicar, or curate, shall in his several charge declare to the people every Sunday, at the time appointed in the communion

Here then two things are very obvious; first that the direction of the Church as to the observance of these days is imperative; and secondly, that every day which is now commanded partakes of a Scriptural and apostolic character. There is some little difference between the calendar of Edward the Sixth and the one now in use. In the former there is one holy day not now observed in any way,—the feast of S. Mary Magdalene. But as S. Mary Magdalene was not of that high order in which we might class the Apostles and Evangelists; so, upon the whole, we need not regret the omission. On the other hand, two festivals, those of S. Paul and S. Barnabas, omitted previously, were restored to the calendar at the last review, as being, though not of the twelve, still Apostles. These two facts clearly show the mind and temper of our Church as to the sort of days she desires to commemorate; and they show how carefully and how Scripturally she was directed in the formation of her calendar.

I shall now say a few words on certain objections which are sometimes brought against the observance of holy days. And first, in regard to the popular objection on the score of Popery. It was on this principle,—namely, the idea that observing the memory of saints necessarily infers the *adoration* of saints,—that the Directory, when it set aside the Prayer Book, also set aside festival days. "There is no day," says the Directory, "commanded in Scripture to

book, whether there be any holy days or fasting days in the week following. And if any do hereafter wittingly offend herein, and, being once admonished thereof by his ordinary, shall again omit that duty, let him be censured according to law, until he submit himself to the due performance of it."

Canon XIII.—Due celebration of Sundays and Holy Days.

"All manner of persons within the Church of England, shall from henceforth celebrate and keep the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, and other holy days, according to God's will and pleasure, and the orders of the Church of England prescribed on that behalf,—that is, in hearing the word of God read and taught, in private and public prayers, in acknowledging their offences to God, and amendment of the same, in reconciling themselves charitably to their neighbours where displeasure hath been, in oftentimes receiving the communion of the body and blood of Christ, in visiting the poor and sick, using all godly and sober conversation."

be kept holy under the Gospel but the Lord's day, which is the Christian Sabbath. Festival days, vulgarly called holy-days, having no warrant in the word of God, are not to be continued." But any reasonable person would at once separate the idea of invoking the saint from that of observing his memory, and that of praising the saint from that of praising God *on his account*. We may praise God on account of the signal gifts of His grace displayed to the world in His Apostles and Evangelists, without any the remotest notion of imputing merit to them. Such a confusion of ideas must certainly be the effect of needless alarm or wilful ignorance. But in addition to this, the notion of a Romanizing tendency in the Church's holy-days would at once be scouted and set at nought if men dwelt upon the simple fact that not a single day stands in the calendar but one commemorating an event or saint of SCRIPTURE. It might be well argued that the commemoration of holy men even *beyond* the times of Scripture would be edifying to the Church, and be likely to promote devotion. The memory of S. Polycarp, for instance, of S. Ignatius, and of other apostolic men who perished in the assertion of the faith of their Redeemer, might very reasonably be made vehicles of edification to the Church. But when this is cheerfully given up,—when it has been thought advisable by our Church to commemorate no saints but those whose names are found in the word of God,—it is really difficult to imagine what tendency there can be found in such observances as these, towards the errors of Rome. We are told by S. Paul (*Hebr.* xiii, 7, 8), to remember them which have the rule over us, which have spoken to us the word of God, whose faith we are to follow, considering the end of their conversation. It is on this principle of example,—of dwelling in meditation on the life and sufferings of men of old, and thereby stirring up our cold and worldly hearts by the thought of what has once been done in Christianity, and therefore may be done again,—of praising God for the manifestation of His Spirit developed in those holy men—the Apostles and Evangelists of the Gospel;—it is on this principle, of keeping them in memory, and animating ourselves by their

examples, that the observance of their commemorative festivals is appointed, and by no means on account of any disposition to hold them up as objects of adoration, or insist upon their merits as sources of mediation. Those evils can surely be separated from the good. Let us adhere faithfully to the words of our communion service, when speaking of the Saints, and we cannot then go wrong. "And we also bless Thy holy name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear, beseeching Thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom."

"*Their good examples.*" Imitation seems to be the leading idea which prevails throughout our Prayer Book. The example of the saint is brought forward sometimes for warning, at other times for imitation, but always with some design of practical teaching. If S. Andrew is commemorated, his *calling* as the first Apostle, is the conspicuous feature, and *our* calling and giving up ourselves as he did to Christ, the teaching; if S. Thomas,—his want of faith is put before us, and our prayer is that "*we* may not want faith"; if S. Stephen,—our teaching, after him, is "to love and bless our persecutors"; if the Holy Innocents,—the prayer is, that we, like them, "may be innocent in life, and constant unto death;" if S. John the Evangelist,—then his doctrine of the "light," the true incarnation and divinity of our Lord, is the point of teaching; if S. Matthias,—it is, that we, remembering into whose place he succeeded as an Apostle, "may be preserved in our Church from false Apostles"; if S. Peter,—that we, the ministers of the word, bishops and priests, "may diligently preach God's word, and the people obediently follow the same", remembering how he specially was commanded to "feed Christ's flock";—and so on throughout the collects. Is there anything of a Romish tendency in all this, further than what is good? Is there anything of a spirit opposed to true religion? On the contrary, how much is there that is truly evangelical! How much is lost when we abandon these examples and patterns of our faith! How many forms of character we may develope and explain!

How much danger may we point out! What zeal we may encourage!—what faith!—what energy!—what suffering for Christ's sake! What patterns of self-denial and perseverance, looking for humble rest and peace by the cross in the Church triumphant, may there not be set before us, while still struggling here, as *they* once struggled in the flesh, in the Church militant. If these things be Popery, we may fearlessly assert that Popery is *so far* good.*

* Our old divines are not backward in their opinions on this duty of the Church. Bp. Jeremy Taylor says: "The memories of the Saints are precious to God, and therefore they ought also to be to us; and such persons who serve God by holy living, industrious preaching, and religious dying, ought to have their names preserved in honour, and God be glorified in them, and their holy lives and doctrines published and imitated; and we by so doing give testimony to the article of the communion of saints." And the learned Hooker still more strongly says: "Touching those festival days which we now observe, their number being no way felt discommodious to the commonwealth, and their grounds such as hitherto have been showed, what remaineth but to keep them throughout all generations holy, severed by manifest notes of difference from other times, adorned with that which most may betoken true, virtuous, and celestial joy?"

And these sentiments only agree with the ancient Fathers, all bringing forward the commemoration of saints as for our imitation, and therein our edification, and nothing more. S. Chrysostom beautifully says: "We are met on these holy festivals, not to praise, but to imitate; not to be hearers of the encomiums, but followers of their worthy actions. Therefore, if any one would praise the martyrs, let him *imitate* the martyrs; and if any one would give the champions of religion their just encomium, let him emulate their labours." And then he closes with this exhortation: "Thou art a soldier of Christ beloved. Put on thine *armour*, and mind not thy *dress*. Thou art a generous combatant. Quit thyself like a man. So shall we imitate these holy ones, so shall we honour these valiant warriors, these crowned champions, these friends of God." "When you see the martyrs despise life, though you be the most stupid and negligent of all creatures, you cannot but entertain sublime and exalted thoughts, contemning pleasures, despising riches, and desiring to have your conversation in heaven. If you languish under disease, the passions of these holy men will engage you to patience: if you are oppressed with poverty, cast but your eye to the bitterness of the torments which they endured, and you have a present consolation." "As plants grow the more for being watered, so will your faith be more and more confirmed, when in the blood of these holy men you will perceive what human nature, under the leading of the Holy Spirit, can achieve,—what, through Jesus Christ, may be accomplished,—if you patiently look to the Author and Finisher of your faith."

Coupled with the objections about a Romanizing tendency in keeping holy the festival days, is another derived from certain isolated texts of Scripture. The fourteenth chapter of the epistle to the Romans is frequently brought forward as an argument of excuse for their violation, as though it gave men liberty to do in this matter what to each seems right in his own eyes. The text is this: "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord, and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it." Rom. xiv, 5. Another text is also brought forward from the epistle to the Galatians: "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years; I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." Gal. iv, 10. Taken by itself, this latter text would seem to rebuke us for the very thing which we are now advocating, and to imply that we were entirely destroying the liberty of the Gospel, by in any way confining our worship to any specific day. But on simply adverting to the context, we find that S. Paul is in these passages guarding his converts against recurrence to the *Jewish* days, and pointing out to them their freedom as Christians from the burdens of the Law. The rebuke would apply if we were to find a Christian in these days going back to the observance of the Jewish passover, or placing his dwelling under tabernacles; or at Pentecost commemorating the delivery of the Law on mount Sinai; but it does not apply when we speak generally on the subject of days. There are many things which our Lord, seemingly on purpose, has left undetermined as to details, but clear and decided as to principles. Our Lord's teaching looks only to the *foundations* of religion; the superstructure He leaves to be raised by another. That other is the Church, who being divinely commissioned from on high, interprets the meaning of her Lord, unfolds and carries into action His principles, and directs the way and manner in which His will shall be performed. Thus the principle being established, that days of observance are according to the teaching of our Lord, the Church pro-

nounces *what* those days shall be, and *how* they shall be observed.* These days may be different in different Churches, and at different times. Bearing reference to Apostolic usage and the appointment of the Church Catholic, each national Church may add days of national solemnity, or appoint days of national rejoicing for the time being; but all proceed on the assumption that such appointments are founded on a scriptural principle. If it be said, in reference to our Lord, that His personal example will only extend to days of *divine* appointment, and that still the question concerning days of *human* or Church appointment is not touched; then we reply that He observed both. Those of the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles were certainly of divine appointment, but the Feast of Dedication was as certainly of human or Church appointment, being appointed by Judas Maccabæus, and not set forth for observance in the records of the Law. But secondly, it may be replied that what is of Church appointment *is* of divine appointment, only *mediately*. The Church has the promise of divine guidance and help. The Church has the promise of prevailing against the gates of hell; and if the Church appoints religious observances, and hallows certain days in accordance with Holy Writ, then those observances and days must be considered as of divine appointment. The example set before us in our blessed Lord is to follow in spirit and in truth, and to "*hear the Church*"; not cavilling or holding back because these things do not suit our habits, or because they interfere with our private judgment, but submitting ourselves to that Church into which at baptism we

* "If it be then demanded whether we observe these times as being thereunto bound by force of divine law, or else by the only positive ordinances of the Church,—I answer to this, that the very law of nature itself, which all men confess to be God's law, requireth in general no less the sanctification of times than of places, persons, and things, unto God's honour. For which cause it hath pleased Him heretofore, as of the rest, so of times likewise, to exact some parts by way of perpetual homage, never to be dispensed withal, nor remitted. Again, to require some other parts of time with as strict exaction, but for less continuance, and of the rest, which were left arbitrary, *to accept what the Church shall in due consideration consecrate voluntarily unto religious uses.*"—*Hooker, Eccl. Pol.* book iv, § 71.

have been incorporated, and by which and through which we have become members of Christ's body; not considering that we of one age and of one country can interpret Scripture better than the men of all ages and of all countries taken together,—not, as Hooker says, "standing at bay with the Church of God, and demanding wherefore the memory of Paul should be kept, rather than the memory of Daniel", —but cheerfully delighting in the opportunity vouchsafed to us of resting from the toil of our worldly labour,—seeking such glad occasions of escape from the carnal things of the world,—of assembling ourselves together in the commemoration of the glories of our faith,—of throwing the bright halo of religion and Christianity over the whole aspect of our lives,—not living a mere *seventh* part of our lives to God, but *all* our lives. "These days are indeed", as one wrote who knew what he wrote,—"these days are the splendour and outward dignity of our religion, forcible witnesses of ancient truth, provocations to the exercise of all piety, shadows of our endless felicity in heaven,—on earth, everlasting records and memorials, wherein they which cannot be driven to hearken unto what we teach, may only, by looking upon that we do, in a manner read whatsoever we believe."*

Let us observe then, the position in which we stand as members of the Church, and let us at least be consistent with ourselves. We all know that the Lord's day is, by the majority of our people, considered a day of rest and special religious worship, and also we know that some few days are added, such as Christmas Day; but here terminates all notion of a religious festival in the mind of the majority. Yet why should the feast of Christmas be selected, while the feast of the Ascension is passed by unheeded? We pick out one or two favourite days, and make them holy days, to the disparagement of the rest; forgetting that the authority which exists for the one exists for the others also. I do not mean to place all the days of our calendar on an equal footing, or to say that the objects of their commemoration are the same in value.

* Hooker, Ecc. Pol. book v, § 71.

I have already pointed out three classes of holy days, in regard to the subjects and persons commemorated; but this only is incontrovertible, that the authority for all is the same. It is said by some that the general occupations of men in the business of the world would of necessity hinder the observance of these days. I reply, that it would be wise in us as a people, if we could but release ourselves from that extreme slavery which binds so many in chains of iron to the cares of this perishable world. I should put it confidently as a political benefit to our country, as well as a religious obligation, to get rid, by means of a more general observance of the Church's festivals, of the all-absorbing claims of mammon which now beset us. Why should the world so severely rule over us? Why should the habits of the tradesman, the manufacturer, and the shopkeeper, as well as those in a higher degree in the scale of the world,—the lawyer and the man of office,—be so utterly and entirely dedicated to what is called *business*, as to prevent both themselves, and all occupied under them, from ever enjoying a day of holy recreation? These days are still indeed called holy days, and rest in our calendar as such; but holy days to the people they emphatically are *not*. The consequence is, that Sunday, the only day of rest which is recognized, is turned away from its hallowed purpose, and made by the labourer and mechanic, as well as, too often, by men of higher degree, a day of reckless debauchery.* The health of our labour-

* A very interesting pamphlet was published some time since by Lord John Manners, on the subject of national holy days, in which a restoration of the Church's days is strongly advocated. The argument of our people's abuse of the few holy days which they do even now enjoy, is there ably controverted by the simple observation that *they have so few, that they do not know how to use them. Give them more, and they will use them better.* Easter Monday and Tuesday behold the people of London, in its lower classes, flocking in dense crowds to Greenwich and similar places, and there spending their time and money in scenes of vice and profligacy. Upon this it is asserted that holy days are bad, and injurious to the labouring classes. But whence does this arise, but from a total perversion of the meaning and use of a holy day? Let it be really, what it is in name—HOLY. Let the Church be the first object of delight, as she is the source from whence the holy day is derived. *Let it be a Church principle of religious*

ing population is undermined by constant toil; their spirits and their energies are depressed. They are a care-worn and miserable race, without any true enjoyment of life, carrying on a constant contest with want and poverty, and yet withal ground down by never-ceasing labour: and all this to supply the rich manufacturer with wealth, and the noble and great with luxuries. Called indeed, they are, and said to be "*in the Church*,"—made members of it by baptism, but living on without partaking of any of its privileges, or sharing in any of its blessings.

The way in which our labouring classes live from day to

joy,—not a mere squandering of money in outrageous scenes of vice; and this not once a year, but frequently and systematically, as in the calendar.—Then doubtless the notion of a holy-day being a day of debauch would quickly disappear. Southey (quoted by Lord John Manners) most truly says: "The want of holy days breaks down and brutalizes the labouring classes; and when they occur seldom, they are uniformly abused."

Sometimes it is said, that by giving our poorer classes exemption from labour, we deprive them of the means of livelihood, and that they would not receive such a gift with any thankfulness. Certainly not, if the masters and employers were to deprive them of their day's wages. But where are the hearts of masters, tradesmen, manufacturers, and others, who employ the labourer, if they deduct wages in this spirit? Certainly the loss of money should be on the master's side, not on the side of the labourer; and if the rich and wealthy, who pinch and exact every farthing's worth of labour out of the poor for their own aggrandizement, have neither the generosity nor the Christianity to think that the pecuniary loss should fall upon themselves and not upon the poor,—then indeed we have nothing further to say; but we may reflect the more on the saying of our Lord: "It is easier for a camel to pass through the needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." Why the very heathens, in their public festivals, ever regarded the poor as the persons to enjoy, and taxed not *them* to pay for such amusements, but the rich. "Shops and courts of judicature were shut up. The labourers rested from their works; the tradesmen from their employments; the mourners intermitted their sorrows; and nothing but ease and pleasure were to be found amongst them; and the expense of all these festivals was at the *public charge*." (See Potter's "Archæologia Græca," of the Religion of Greece, chap. xix, bk. ii.) It was the business of the *State* to supply and maintain them. Alas! how Christians, as a political body, in this country, fail in comparison with even the Athenian heathens, who thus did more in honour of their false and imaginary gods, than we who have the Lord Jesus Christ for our Redeemer and Deliverer.

day in great manufacturing towns,—their total alienation from religious rest and religious joyfulness,—their complete absorption as mere creatures of burden, mere instruments for the accumulation of wealth, to fill the coffers of hard taskmasters, with whom they have no one feeling or interest in common,—is indeed a frightful picture to contemplate in this Christian land. It would be surely better,—more as though we believed what we profess,—if this drudgery could in some sort be foregone, and, with a little sparing of our riches, we could suffer our thoughts to soar upwards, where alone true riches are to be found,—better would it be if our habits and ways of life, in ourselves and our dependents, could be moulded more towards a generous indulgence in the relaxations and simple festivities which the Church, our wise mother, has provided in her holy days; and we could see our population, as in olden times, first betaking themselves to the devotions of the Church, recording her saints and martyrs, and then, in the amusements and festive sports of our country, receiving some short respite from the toils of their daily labour.

But all this may be considered as fanciful, and the men of this hard age may scout it as an imaginary, unreal thing. It may be so *to them*. But the Church is not the world. The Church is not the cold and sordid genius of the market-place nor of the exchange, nor of the warehouse of the merchant, the office of the statesman, or the chamber of the lawyer. But the Church is the mother of the faithful. What she desires and prepares, the humble child will follow and enjoy. Let those who will, forsake her teaching, and despise her privileges;—"they have their reward." For us, let us rather join together in the words prepared for us on one of those holy days of which we have been speaking, and ever with a faithful spirit say:

"O Almighty God, who hast built thy Church on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the head corner stone, grant us so to be joined together in unity of spirit, by their doctrine, that we may be made a holy temple, acceptable unto Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

SERMON VIII.

THE FASTS OF THE CHURCH.

JOEL i, 14.

"*Sanctify ye a fast, call a solemn assembly, gather the elders, and all the inhabitants of the land, into the house of the Lord your God.*

A VERY slight degree of thought will show that there can hardly be in human things any act of rejoicing, which can be strictly so called, standing alone. It must always have reference to some previous state of feeling contrary to it, and in a change from which it has arisen. Let us go back to that first state of human nature in the garden of Eden, described in the book of Genesis. Happiness was then the general condition of man,—undeviating, undisturbed. Sorrow was not known, because sin was not known. Regret, remorse, repentance, were unfelt, because their causes were not in existence. But as there could be no sorrow, so also there could be no rejoicing, as contradistinguished from the general tenor of happiness prevailing. Adam was made altogether good, holy, happy; and until a specific act had been committed, which involved sin, no specific act could be imagined as demanding rejoicing. The first sound of triumph or rejoicing which we hear in Holy Scripture is the song of Moses in the fifteenth chapter of Exodus. But its cause is very evident, —the previous danger in the Red Sea. The first feast which we find to be commemorated is that of the *Passover*. Its source was evident—the change that took place from a state of persecution by the Egyptian king, to one of

security. Hannah records a song of triumph and rejoicing at the birth of Samuel, because it was a change in her state to be a mother in Israel, from having been under the curse of barrenness. David sang, and danced before the ark, because it was a great revulsion of feeling from the deep depression under which the whole nation had been, consequent upon the previous loss of the ark, and its capture by the Philistines. In the parable of the prodigal, the father is described as *rejoicing*, "making merry and being glad." But why in respect of the *wicked* son, when there was no such demonstration in respect of the *good* son? Because there was a change of feeling in the recovery of the one from a state of sin, which cause did not exist in the other; and for this very same reason our Lord Himself says: "There is *more joy* over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance:"—because in the latter there was none of the preceding sorrow, without which that peculiar sort of joy could not exist.

Rejoicing being then in this sense a relative term, and necessarily involving some previous state of lamentation, at the escape from which, or upon the resolution of which, it can alone be called into play,—it follows that in the Church, which runs parallel with nature, we should, after finding a festival day appointed, naturally look for its cause or source in an opposite day,—a day of sorrow:—in other words, that immediately on being told of *feasting*, we should think of FASTING. If we rejoice in Christmas, why do we so rejoice?—we look back to Advent. If at Easter,—we look back to Lent and the Passion. If on the days of the apostles and martyrs,—we look back to the vigils in which the sufferings of the martyrs had to be dwelt upon in sorrow. Thus then it is that in every sense it becomes right that, as we have spoken of the rejoicing, we must also speak of the sorrowing; and the Feasts of the Church being duly celebrated, we are bound to think also of her FASTS.

In the five books of Moses with which the Scripture history opens, the first instance of fasting is that of Moses himself, who was in the mount for forty days and forty nights

without bread and without water. But this was a miraculous or extraordinary fast,—not a fast of sin, but of sanctification ; and must not be considered in the present case. We have, however, in Leviticus, a solemn national fast recorded, called the Day of Atonement : "On the tenth day of the seventh month, there shall be a day of atonement. It shall be a holy convocation to you, and ye shall afflict your souls." This afflicting of the soul in mourning, we may conclude to have been, according to the Jewish custom, coupled with the affliction of the body by a fast. After the time of Moses, in any great national or individual calamity, fasting is continually mentioned as the Jewish custom. Joshua, in the defeat at Ai, "rent his clothes, and fell to the earth upon his face before the ark of the Lord until the eventide." (Joshua vii, 6.) The children of Israel, on their defeat by the children of Benjamin, "went up and came unto the house of God, and wept, and sat there before the Lord, and fasted that day until even." (Judges xx, 26.) The children of Israel when assembled at Mizpeh, under the direction of Samuel, on account of the ark having been captured by the Philistines, "gathered together and drew water, and poured it out before the Lord, and fasted on that day, and said, We have sinned against the Lord." (1 Sam. vii, 6.)

If we desire individual cases of fasting after sin, or under affliction, we find them readily :—in David, who fasted on account of the child of Bathsheba : "David fasted, and went in, and lay all night upon the earth." (2 Samuel xii, 16.) And in Esther : "Go, gather together all the Jews that are present in Shushan, and fast ye for me, and neither eat nor drink three days, night and day. I also and my maidens will fast." (Esther iv, 16.) And in Daniel : "I set myself unto the Lord, to seek by prayer and supplication *with fasting*, and sackcloth and ashes." (Daniel ix, 3.) If we desire sanction for it as a religious duty of national assemblies, we readily find it in the continual exhortations of the prophets, and injunctions of the kings, as, for instance, "Jehosaphat proclaimed a fast." (2 Chron. xx, 3.) "Ezra proclaimed a fast." (Ezra viii, 21.) In Jeremiah : "They proclaimed a fast

before the Lord." (Jeremiah xxxvi, 9.) In Joel: "Sanctify ye a fast, call a solemn assembly." (Joel i, 14.)

Here then we have abundant proof in every point of view (both as an individual and a national religious duty), of the Jewish custom having come from Divine authority to *fast before the Lord*. And the very moment we pass forward from the Old to the New Dispensation, the great forerunner of our Lord stands out conspicuous before us, —John the Baptist, whose meat was locusts and wild honey, and whose dwelling was the wilderness. In S. John we have the connecting link of the Jewish and the Christian covenant; and when he ceased, on the presence of the Messiah, to preach any further his baptism of repentance, then that very Messiah Himself steps forward, and marks the commencement of His preaching by fasting forty days and forty nights; and being afterwards an hungered, contends with and destroys that wicked one, who till then had reigned triumphant in the souls of men.

But now we have to consider whether in the New Testament this Jewish custom of fasting was to be continued, or whether, as many other of the Levitical laws and customs, it was to cease with the introduction of the Gospel. Setting aside our Lord's example in His great fast of forty days, as being miraculous and beyond nature, still we have in His teaching so many allusions to it, that very little doubt can remain of His will that it should be a permanent Christian duty. In the first place, in the sermon on the mount (S. Matthew vi), we have the two unquestioned duties of prayer and almsgiving set before us. But together with these two duties, in the very same language, and in the very same order, is a third,—that of *fasting*. It is true our Lord does not give a direct command for fasting; neither, however, does He for prayer, nor for alms-giving. He assumes them to be duties recognized, and already practised, — all three equally so. He does not comment on the duties themselves, but only on certain violations of them. It is thus: "*When thou doest thine alms*," [as of course all men do] "do not sound a trumpet before thee." "*When thou prayest*," [as of course all men do] "thou shalt

not be as the hypocrites are." "Moreover, *when ye fast*," [as of course all men do] "anoint thy head and wash thy feet, and be not as the hypocrites." It is quite conclusive by this, that, in our Lord's teaching, prayer, almsgiving, and fasting, stand upon a parallel as equally recognized duties.

But, moreover, we find fasting set forth as of great efficacy, in being a sign of faith and obedience, in *Matt.* xvii, 21. When the disciples were not able to work a miracle, our Lord told them the reason: "This kind goeth not forth but by prayer and fasting." Again, it is placed before us as a sign of mourning,—an outward emblem, by which we may represent to God our penitential feelings, and in which affliction of our bodies, we may the deeper feel the affliction of our souls. The disciples of John Baptist were scrupulous in fasting,—the disciples of our Lord not so. They asked our Lord why this was. He said: "Can ye make the children of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast in those days." The outward sign of fasting is here evidently taken to represent the inward feeling of sorrow; but as the inward feeling of sorrow had not yet been called forth, the outward sign was inappropriate. But by the expression, "*then shall ye fast*," we may reasonably infer that, after our Lord's departure, fasting was to form a legitimate part of Christian duty.

But let us now turn to the history of the Church after our Lord's departure. What mention do we there find of it? Cornelius is there described as finding favour with God in *fasting*, coupled with almsgiving and prayer. In the appointment of Barnabas and Paul to go to the Gentiles, it is said, "as they ministered unto the Lord, and *fasted*." In the appointment of elders in *Acts* xiv, it is said: "And when they had ordained them elders in every Church, and had prayed with *fasting*". S. Paul speaks too of "persons giving themselves to *fasting* and prayer" (1 Cor. vii, 5); and of himself, "in *fastings* often" (2 Cor. xi, 27); and of the ministers of God generally, as "approving them-

selves in stripes and in *fastings*" (2 Cor. vi, 4). So that here we have the practice of the Church, and the apostolic precept, fully bearing out the principle as approved in the eyes of God.

It is true that in the Gospel no days are fixed for fasting, —no special times or rules laid down as to what fasting is, nor when and how often it is to be exercised. But let us observe, that neither are days or times fixed for prayer, or for any other religious duty. In this consists the office of the Church. The Scriptures teach the principle, the Church teaches how that principle shall be carried into effect. Prayer would soon be lost, and divine worship itself would altogether cease, if we had not a specific time appointed for such observance by the Church. And so with fasting. Were it left only as a duty to be performed at any time, it would in all probability be performed at no time. Wisely then the Church steps in, and fixes that which perhaps we should be disinclined to fix ourselves. She appoints penitential days, on which, more specifically, human sins, human wants, and human infirmities, may form the subject of our meditation; when she says to us: "Abstain from pleasure, abstain from society, abstain more or less from food, and watch and pray with fasting."

This brings us to the Table of the Fasts and Days of Abstinence appointed in the Book of Common Prayer. It is as follows:

A Table of the Vigils, Fasts, and Days of Abstinence, to be observed in the Year.

The Evens or Vigils before
- The Nativity of our Lord
- The Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary
- The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin
- Easter Day
- Ascension Day
- Pentecost
- Saint Matthias
- Saint John Baptist
- Saint Peter
- Saint James
- Saint Bartholomew
- Saint Matthew

Saint Simon and Saint Jude
Saint Andrew
Saint Thomas
All Saints

Note.—That if any of these Feast-Days fall upon a Monday, then the Vigil or Fast-Day shall be kept upon the Saturday, and not upon the Sunday next before it.

Days of Fasting, or Abstinence.

1. The Forty Days of Lent
2. The Ember-Days at the Four Seasons, being the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after
   1. The First Sunday in Lent
   2. The Feast of Pentecost
   3. September 14
   4. December 13
3. The Three Rogation-Days, being the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, before Holy Thursday, or the Ascension of our Lord
4. All the Fridays in the Year, except Christmas Day.

By examining this table, we shall find the rule of the Church to amount to this: Two annual fasts,—namely, Lent and the Rogation Days: one quarterly fast,—the Ember Days: one weekly fast,—Friday: while, scattered throughout the year, as preceding certain festival days, we have the Vigils. I shall now endeavour to explain the reason for fixing each of these periods, and show their foundation in the customs of the early Christians.

First, then, the annual fast of Lent. This is sometimes called the Quadragesimal Fast, from its period of forty days, which is doubtless taken from the number of the days on which our blessed Lord fasted in the wilderness. Whether it is of apostolical institution or not, has been very much disputed by learned men; but certainly it is a fast of great antiquity.* S. Jerome says: "We observe

* It appears that great diversity of practice prevailed in regard to the number of days included in the Lenten fast. According to Bingham, it is even questioned whether the title "*quadragesimal*" was not originally derived from forty *hours* rather than forty *days*; but he cites many contradictory opinions on the subject. In after times, some Churches kept their Lent for six weeks, and some for seven

our Lent in the year, according to the tradition of the Apostles."* "Moses and Elias, fasting forty days, were filled with the conversation of God; and our Lord Himself fasted so many days in the wilderness, that He might leave to us the solemn days of fasting."† Cassian says, that "as long as the perfection of the primitive Church remained inviolable, there was no observation of Lent; but when men began to decline from apostolical fervour of devotion, and gave themselves overmuch to worldly affairs, then the priests in general agreed to recall them from secular cares by a canonical indiction of fasting, and setting aside

weeks. In most, it was six weeks, beginning at Quadragesima Sunday, now our first *Sunday*, though not our first *day* of Lent. Six weeks, deducting the Sundays, would make thirty-six days. To these were added, in the time of Gregory the Great, four additional days, making Lent begin on *Ash Wednesday*. Ash Wednesday is evidently an addition of the Western Church, for Lent was practised as a fast six hundred years without it. We must not, therefore, set much store by the exact number of forty days, further than its correspondence with the great fasts of Moses, Elias, Jonas, and our Lord. We should rather incline to depend upon it as of Church authority, which for our purpose is quite sufficient.

It may be as well to note that the titles of the Sundays in our calendar, derived from the Lenten fast, run in loose numbers of ten, and do not correspond exactly with the real number of the days. Thus Quadragesima is the thirty-sixth day from Easter, excluding Sundays, or the forty-second, including Sundays. From this, counting in tens, though in reality it would be by sevens, we have Quinquagesima the fiftieth day, Sexagesima the sixtieth day, and Septuagesima the seventieth day, before Easter.

It may be as well also to note the reason of the name of the first day of Lent, as now appointed. It is called "Dies cinerum," the day of ashes, because the penitents used to present themselves on this day before the bishop clothed in sackcloth and with bare feet, confessing their sins. After kneeling in their confession, ashes were thrown over them, and in the presence of the congregation they were cast out of the Church, under the words of Adam's curse: "In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread." This discipline, or something similar to it, is alluded to in our Commination Service, as desirable to be restored, for the sake of purity in the Church, and for the comfort of those distressed under sin, who now live on from year to year, without means either of confession or absolution. At Easter, the penitents, having gone through their appointed penance in Lent, were absolved, and restored to communion.

* Hieron. Ep. 54 ad Marcellam. † Hieron. in Isaiah 58, p. 202.

a tenth of their time to God."* And S. Chrysostom gives the same account: "Why do we fast these forty days? Many heretofore were used to come to the communion indevoutly and inconsiderately, especially at this time, when Christ first gave it to His disciples. Therefore, our forefathers considering the mischief arising from such careless approaches, appointed forty days for fasting and prayer, and hearing of sermons, and holy assemblies, that all men in these days being carefully purified by prayer and almsdeeds, and fastings, and watchings, and tears, and confession of sins, and other the like exercises, might come, according to their capacity, with a pure conscience to the holy table."† And S. Austin the same: "We know out of the Gospel what day our Lord suffered and was buried, and rose again from the dead; and therefore the observation of these days was added by the councils of the Fathers, and the whole world was persuaded to celebrate the Pasch after that manner. The forty days' fast has authority both in the Old Testament, from the fast of Moses and Elias, and also from the Gospel, because our Lord fasted so many days."‡ From this we see its great antiquity in the Church, and its use,—namely, as a preparation for the feast of the Passover, or Easter. The forty days are counted from Ash Wednesday to Easter Eve, excepting the Sundays, which were never considered as fasting days; for Sunday being a *feast* (see the table of the feasts in the preceding lecture), it would be impossible to celebrate two contraries at once. The week which concludes the period of Lent is called the Holy Week, or Passion Week;§ and is observed with

* Cassian, Collat. 21, cap. 30.

† Chrysostom, Hom. 52, tom. v, p. 709. The above passages are quoted from Bingham.

‡ Aug. Ep. ad Januar. 119, c. 15.

§ It was called also "the Great Week," not as S. Chrysostom says, because it consisted of longer days or more in number, but because at this time "great things" were wrought for us by our Lord. "For in this week the ancient tyranny of the devil was dissolved. Death was extinct, the strong man was bound, his goods were spoiled, sin was abolished, the curse was destroyed, paradise was opened, heaven became accessible, men and angels were joined together, the middle

even more strictness than the other weeks, each day having a separate Gospel and Epistle, tracing the history of our Lord and His sufferings, from His entry into Jerusalem to His death upon the cross on Good Friday. Saturday is the eve of Easter, on which, at the night or evening service, the fast terminates. In ancient times, the fast of Lent was a time of great discipline. Catechumens were prepared by fasting and prayer for baptism, and penitents underwent their several degrees of penance, and were prepared for absolution. This discipline is still thought of in our Church, though little practised. On Ash Wednesday we have a special service, stating the Church's desire that it should be preserved, called "The Commination or Denouncement of God's Anger and Judgment against Sinners." This service is indeed full of sublime language, savouring more strongly than any other part of our Prayer Book of the godly discipline of the ancient Church. It reminds us of our miserable unworthiness. It exhorts us to repentance in the most forcible and tender language; and the Church's opinion as to fasting,—the duty of which we are now speaking,—cannot be more strongly described: "Be favourable, O Lord, be favourable to Thy people, who turn to Thee in weeping, FASTING, and praying."

The next annual fast in the Church of England is "The Rogation days",—by no means so solemn and penitential

wall of partition was broken down, the barriers were taken away, the God of Peace made peace between things in heaven and things on earth. Therefore, it is called *the Great Week*."—(Chrysos. Hom. in Ps. 145, de Hebdom. Magnâ.) In this week, the degree of fasting was much more strict than at other times of Lent. The fasting was now called ξηροφαγία, or *feeding on dry things*, namely, bread and salt, and that only in the evening. In reading of the intensity of fasting practised by the ancient Church as a system of discipline, we are quite overwhelmed and confounded at our short comings. Not only dry bread and water very frequently their only food, but also many days, specially in this "great week," were passed altogether without food. S. Chrysostom also mentions that in this week the Christians would be more liberal in their distribution of alms. For "the nearer they approached to the passion and resurrection of Christ, the more they thought themselves obliged to show all manner of acts of mercy and kindness towards their brethren."—See *Bingham*, book xxi, c. i, § 26.

a fast as that of Lent, but still a fast. These are the three days before the feast of the Ascension; and as Lent is a preparation for the glorious feast of the Resurrection of our Lord, so these days are a preparation for the final consummation of our Lord's life on earth,—namely, His ascension to sit at the right hand of the Father. Formerly the whole fifty days of Pentecost (that is, between Easter and Whitsuntide) were festival days without interruption; and it does not quite appear how these days grew up into fasting days. The change seems to have been commenced by Mamercus, bishop of Vienna, in the fifth century; but in many Churches, particularly the Greek Churches, they have never been received at all. Since, however, from whatever cause, they are appointed now by our Church, let us obediently use them. They are called *Rogation* Days, from "rogare", to ask or pray; and sometimes they were wont to be called Litany Days, because particular prayers, rogations, or litanies, used to be offered up in processions through the streets, invoking the blessing of God upon the fruits of the earth. In the injunctions of Queen Elizabeth we find a particular direction for this, and the curate is enjoined, "together with the substantial men of the parish, to walk about the boundaries, and then to return to the Church and offer their common prayers". It is needless to say that but little of this custom is now remaining; and that little but a temporal and profane mockery of what it used to be. We hear of the parish constables, with a rabble of unruly boys, perambulating the parish boundaries; but of the clergy joining in any solemn supplication to God, we hear nothing. Thus it is, as in so many other cases,—the solemnities of the Church are lost in the carelessness of a profane and ungodly age.

We next come to the quarterly fasts. These are sometimes called the fasts of the four seasons, being observed in the four quarters of the year. Originally they appear to have been independent of preparation for ordination, but simply to have been appointed in relation to the dependance of man upon the fruits of the earth, according to the seasons; but in after times, as in our own Church at this day, they were more especially made times of preparation for the

clergy before their ordination, and prayers are directed to be offered up in their behalf. The weeks in which these fasts occur are called Ember weeks. Bingham says, that Gregory the Seventh was the first who made the fasts of the four seasons to agree in point of time with the Ember fasts, before which time the ordination of the clergy was not confined to particular seasons. The word EMBER is most probably derived from a Saxon word, signifying "*a course*", and, therefore, when we say "Ember days", we mean days which come according to some specific course. The course appointed in our Prayer Book is: for the Spring season, the second week in Lent; for the Summer, Pentecost; for the Autumn, September; and for Winter, Advent. Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, are the only fasting days of the week; though the prayers for the clergy are directed to be offered every day. The reason of this fast is surely very plain and simple. The salvation of men; their happiness; their right instruction; the prosperity of the Church; truth of doctrine; holiness of life among the people; and, ultimately, the whole welfare of mankind;—all depend, under God, on the selection of proper persons to fill the holy office of the priesthood. Unless the priesthood, and over that the episcopate, be sound and pure, faithful, and without hypocrisy, it is vain to expect a people otherwise than ungodly. Surely then does it become the Church to pray and fast on those especial times when the laying on of hands is about to take place. In the thirteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and also in the fourteenth chapter, we have our Scriptural example for this most necessary duty; but alas! how few think of it, or observe it. Inconsiderate persons abuse the clergy; criticise their attainments; censure their ignorance; and blame their want of judgment: but have those very persons considered whether, by their prayers and fasting, they might not have prevailed with God to make their clergy better? The bishops lay hands suddenly on unworthy persons. Unworthy persons enter into holy orders for temporal gain. Thoughtless of the sacred responsibility which they undertake, men are invested with the office of teachers, who ought rather to be

the taught. Can we then wonder at the mischief which ensues? The Church's offices are bought and sold. Simoniacal men minister at God's altar. The government of the day prefers to the episcopate those who will be subservient as political partisans. Then is reacted again the laying on of hands carelessly upon unworthy and unfit persons; and so, as it were by a circle of error, the Church is lost. If the people care for none of these things,—if they do not pray,—if they do not fast, as they are bidden,—if they do not show some earnestness and anxiety on this matter,—if they do not seek of God that help and direction for His Church, which at all times, but specially now in days of schism on the part of the laity, and cowardice on the part of the clergy, is so conspicuous, —then of a surety the days of our Church are numbered. Though the promise of Christ is sure, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church altogether, yet it would appear that, like the seven Churches of Asia, the candlestick of this, as a national Church, may be taken away. One of the notes of the Church is unity. If unity disappears from among us, and leaves us torn and racked with contests and quarrels, as we now are, what shall we become? Earnestly would I exhort all who really love the Church as more than a mere name, to use these solemn days of fasting and prayer in the Ember weeks. Afflict yourselves in the soul and in the body for the Church, as the Apostles did of old. Let each man's prayer go up before the throne of Grace, that God may have mercy upon our sins, and that "the bishops and pastors of the flock may lay hands suddenly on no man, but faithfully and wisely make choice of fit persons to serve in the sacred ministry of His Church."

We now go on to speak of the *Vigils*. These, under another name, are sometimes called *Eves*. They are both days preceding a festival, with this difference, that a vigil is an eve with fasting, while the simple eve has no fast. And in looking at the calendar, we shall see that where the eve occurs without a vigil, it is owing to the presence of some other holy day preceding, which is itself a feast. As in the case of the feast of S. Stephen,—it has no vigil,

because the feast of Christmas immediately precedes it. Other eves upon which no feast occurs, are made vigils. The vigils are certainly not of that strict penitential character which belongs to the other fasts; still, the Church has ever desired them to be kept holy. The meaning of a vigil is a watch. The idea of watching is not unfamiliar to the reader of Scripture, as associated with prayer: "Watch and pray, lest ye enter into temptation";—as that of prayer is not unfamiliar, as associated with fasting. The meaning of *to watch* is to be ready for something approaching,—to be on the look out,—to expect and keep awake in anxiety for something. Thus then, when any great festival was approaching, such as Christmas or Easter, or the day of a saint or martyr, the early Christians watched for it; and this they did by sitting up all night in the Church, joining together in psalmody, and prayer. The day of the martyr was always considered the day of his birth (his birth into the kingdom of heaven), although in reality it was the commemoration of his death. But the festival itself being dedicated to the joyful record of his crown of glory, the day preceding was set apart for the record of the sufferings through which he had won that crown. And this accounts for the opposition of the two days so closely placed together. This ancient manner of performing the vigil was in after-times set aside; and the fasting part was transferred to the early part of the day, leaving the commemoration to commence at the evening service. Thus our Church commands the collect of the festival to be used at the evening service of the day preceding; and it is thence called the vigil or eve of the festival. Now the question is, how shall we observe these days at present. We may easily do so, by making the day a day of abstinence from ordinary and profane pleasures, and by temperance in food. After spending the day in abstinence, we may attend divine service at even-song as a special commemoration; and joining in the service of the Church, may lift up our souls to God in psalmody and prayer. Easter Eve and Christmas Eve are still observed among us,—but observed, it may be feared, by many, as mere *temporal* occasions of rejoicing. Let us, as the Church

would have us, make them *spiritual;* and let us extend the same feeling to the other days which are commanded in the Prayer Book, remembering that if the early Christians gladly spent the whole night in prayer and watching, it is but little that is demanded of us, to use an hour for the same purposes. Alcuin says: "These days we call *vigils.* Eating more sparingly then usual, we devoutly preface the solemnities [of the martyrs] with the due observance of fasts, that, purified by the abstinence of the preceding day, we may the more worthily celebrate the joy of the following festival".*

Lastly, we go on to speak of the weekly fast. One day in the week the English Church sets apart as a day of fasting, and that is Friday. In the ancient Church there were two days in every week, Wednesday and Friday. They were called half-fasts,—*semi-jejunia.* Tertullian says: "Why do we set apart the fourth and sixth days for our fasts"?† And Origen says: "We have the forty days of Lent consecrated to fasting. We have the fourth and sixth days of the week".‡ And many others of the Fathers speak in the same way, showing clearly enough that Wednesday as well as Friday were weekly days of fasting. Friday is certainly the more observable day of the two, as being the day of our Lord's crucifixion; and as Easter Day gives us the Lord's Day or Sunday throughout our year,—the weekly feast,—so Good Friday gives us throughout the year the weekly fast. These weekly fasts were by no means of the same strict character as that of Lent, even in the ancient Church. In fact, the very name,—half-fasts, or *semi-jejunia,*—shows this. The weekly fast was not kept longer than three o'clock in the afternoon, whereas the Lenten fast was not over till the evening. But be it so. Let us acknowledge that the Wednesday fast of the ancient Church may be set aside. Let us acknowledge also that the Friday fast may not be of that severe character which Lent is; still how miser-

* Quoted from Dr. Pusey's Tract, which the reader will do well to consult, upon the whole principle and duty of fasting.

† Tertullian de Jejun. cap. 14.

‡ Origen, Hom. 10 in Levit. tom. i, p. 159.

ably do Churchmen fall short, in point of practice, of observing *any day* as a weekly fast. Public banquets are frequently seen, at which the highest people of the country, to whose example we should look, are found feasting, when the Church says—"fast." In fact, no notice whatever is taken of the day, either in public or private life. As a general rule, it is discarded altogether. Yet these men who contentedly violate this duty, take up the Prayer Book, and say they make it their book of devotion. Surely it is good, that in this world of mammon and carnal indulgence, once in the week we should have a day marked out as a day of abstinence from ordinary pleasures and mixed society. We ought indeed to be glad to have an excuse and a reason ready, by which we may say, "This day is to me a day of retirement. This day I turn to God in solemn meditation." Let that reason be given, as the Church gives it, in her Book of Common Prayer. Men generally turn Sunday into Friday, and Friday into Sunday. Why not keep the days as the Church means them? Sunday as a day of holy festivity and gladness, but Friday as a day of retirement. It would be well simply to reflect on the Church's wish in this matter, and obey her. As Lent is to the year, so let Friday be to the week, each in its proportion leading us to the reflection that this life must have an end.

I have now explained the Scriptural ground, and the Church's authority as derived from Scripture, for days of fasting; and I have shown what these days are, according to our Church's laws as expressed in the Book of Common Prayer. But it is obvious that much difficulty may exist in men's minds, as to *what fasting means,—to what extent it is to be carried,*—and *to what end it serves.* I would add a few words on these points.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor says: "Fasting, if it be considered in itself, without relation to spiritual ends, is a duty no where enjoined or counselled. But Christianity hath to do with it, as it may be made an instrument of the Spirit, by subduing the lusts of the flesh, or removing any hindrances of religion. And it hath been practised

by all ages of the Church, and advised in order to three ministries : 1. To prayer. 2. To mortification of bodily lusts. 3. To repentance."* Now all these objects may be brought together and arranged under the one leading idea of *clearing the soul of the earthly and debasing tendencies of our carnal nature.* This would be either retrospective in regard to repentance, present in regard to prayer, or prospective in regard to holiness. The body is the great hindrance to the soul's salvation. Subdue that body, then, by any device within our reach, and we are furthering the great end of our life. It will not be gainsaid that self-denial is one great principle of Christianity,—the chastening and counteracting of the works of the flesh, which, if left unchecked, must inevitably lead to destruction. It will not be gainsaid either that this great principle of self-denial is not to be acquired by a sudden impulse or violent passage out of habitual self-indulgence, but gradually. All things are to be learned in religion, as in morals and in other teaching, by lessons in little things, before we attain to great things ; by the mastery of details, before we attempt the accomplishment

* Holy Living and Dying, chap. iv, § 5.

Exactly the same language is held in our Book of Homilies :

"There be three ends whereunto if our fast be directed, it is then a work profitable to us, and accepted of God.

"1. The first is, to chastise the flesh, that it be not too wanton, but tamed and brought in subjection to the spirit. This respect had S. Paul in his fast, when he said, 'I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection, lest by any means it cometh to pass that, when I have preached to others, I myself be found a castaway.'"

"The second, that the spirit may be more earnest and fervent in prayer. To this end fasted the prophets and teachers that were at Antioch, before they sent forth Paul and Barnabas to preach the Gospel. The same two Apostles fasted for the like purpose, when they commended to God, by their earnest prayers, the congregations that were at Antioch, Pisidia, Iconium, and Lystra, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles.

"3. The third, that our fast be a testimony and witness with us before God, of our humble submission to His High Majesty, when we confess and acknowledge our sins unto Him, and are inwardly touched with sorrowfulness of heart, bewailing the same in the affliction of our bodies. These are the three ends or right uses of fasting."—*First part of the Homily on Fasting.*

of a whole. So then, self-denial, as a part of our *character*, being the object, we must learn it by these little lessons. To deny oneself in food, in dress, or in society, will steal its way onwards as a part of our habitual character, and make us of a self-denying spirit. It will give us the power of mastering ourselves, and in times of temptation will furnish us, by God's grace, with the strength needed for victory. It is thus that S. Paul says: "*Mortify*, therefore, your members which are upon the earth" (Coloss. iii, 5). And our Lord Himself: "If any man will come after me, let him *deny himself*, and take up his cross and follow me" (Matt. xvi, 24). S. Augustin, in his Confessions, says (how truly, every man who knows himself will readily confess): "This hast Thou taught me, that I should set myself to take food as physic. But while I am passing from the discomfort of emptiness to the content of replenishing, in the very passage, the snare of concupiscence besets me. Health being the cause of eating and drinking, there joineth itself as an attendant a dangerous pleasure, which mostly endeavours to go before it, so that I may for her sake do what I say I do, or wish to do, for health's sake. Nor have each the same measure; for what is enough for health, is too little for pleasure. And oft it is uncertain whether it be the necessary care of the body which is yet asking for sustenance, or whether a voluptuous deceivableness of greediness is proffering its services. In this uncertainty, the unhappy soul rejoiceth, and therein prepares an excuse to shield itself, glad that it appeareth not what sufficeth for the moderation of health, that, under the cloak of health, it may disguise the matter of gratification. These temptations I daily endeavour to resist, and I call on Thy right hand, and to Thee do I refer my perplexities."*

In this unfolding of the heart lies one secret value of fasting. In this we see how a faithful man, searching his own spirit, will learn so habitually to subdue himself, that the whole soul come out nearer to God, in self-examination, in humility, and in watchfulness.

Nor is it only this secret searching of one's self, leading

* Augustin. Confess. book x, § 44, Dr. Pusey's translation.

to self-mastery, that is the end of fasting; but there is in it and beside it a far higher doctrine, though partaking of the same character. It is this,—*a communion with Christ.* The Christian life, in every aspect, is one of *suffering.* It is in holy baptism begun, as we are said to be "crucified unto the world." And S. Paul speaks especially of "knowing Him, and the power of his resurrection, and *the fellowship of His sufferings.*" Now it frequently happens that this "fellowship of Christ's sufferings" is involuntary, and that the usual course of the world's afflictions does for us this great work, whether we will or no; but then the more we partake of it, the better; and if our life be smooth and prosperous,—if our bodily health be strong and vigorous,—it is the end of fasting to take us out of this dangerous vigour and smoothness, for otherwise we have no fellowship with Him who "knew not where to lay His head." Pain of the body, which is in some degree created by a craving after food, when we resolutely abstain from it, should make us think of Christ. To think of Christ, is to have spiritual communion with Him. In some degree we then suffer with Him. We are more like Him. We are with Him, and He with us. We are reminded of what He endured for our sakes, and the cause of that endurance,—our own sins. Then from this the mind dives down in repentance to think of the wretchedness of that nature which caused so awful and fearful an agony as that of which the garden of Gethsemane was the scene. Then with Him our spirits gain gentleness, and patience, and contentment. Then with Him we cry out: "Thy will be done, O God, not mine." Then with Him we are ready to be reviled, and spit upon, and to be buffeted by the world; and are glad, welcoming the hour when with Him suffering we may say: "It is finished." Here then is an end for the great, the noble, and the rich,—the healthy, the strong, and the prosperous. Why is the saying of our Lord so fearfully true about "*rich men*"? Because they have so seldom an opportunity of having any fellowship with Christ's sufferings. Let them then make for themselves this fellowship, *by fasting.* Not indeed one single act of fasting, and then a recurrence to their old ways; but a habit and principle

of fasting according to the Church's ordinances. This may be to them a safety and protection,—a hope and comfort. Here, in this little self-chastisement, they may be brought nearer to Him who died for them, and, though rich, yet see with Lazarus Abraham's bosom.

Such then being allowed to be *ends of fasting*, we come to a still more difficult question than any yet proposed, when we would know *to what extent it is to be carried*. The early Christians do not appear to have had any decided or positive rule in this matter, but left it open to the circumstances of each Church and each individual. It is evident that in warm climates a greater degree of fasting could with facility be exercised than in northern climates; and also in individuals, those whose bodies are exposed to hard labour could not endure the same degree of abstinence from food, as those whose lives are sedentary, and whose occupations are gentle. Socrates says, as quoted by Bingham: "We may observe, not only a difference in the number of days, but in the manner of abstinence. For some abstain from all living creatures; others, of all living creatures only eat fish; some eat fowls together with fish, because, according to Moses, they say they come of water; others abstain from seeds or berries, and eggs; others eat dry bread only, and some not so much as that. There are some that fast till nine o'clock,—that is, three in the afternoon,—and then eat any kind of meat. Other nations observe other customs in their fasts, and that for various reasons. And since no one can show any written rule about this, it is plain the Apostles left this matter free to every one's liberty and choice, that no one should be compelled to do a good thing out of necessity or fear".* Hence we see great latitude and freedom left to us in the *manner*, so long as we can but attain *the thing*. Let each of us, according to his ability, according to his strength of body, *do what he can*. Abstinence or self-denial in the matter of food is the principle, keeping in view the teaching of S. Augustin,—that we do not cheat ourselves into going beyond what is necessary for health, but

* Socrat. lib. v, c. 22.

take care to avoid that which is pleasurable. We shall then in our degree be fasting; and so, beginning by little, we may learn to make the body bear more. Let us either deprive ourselves of one meal in the day, at first,—or let us take food less in quantity and inferior in quality,—or let us fix some hour in the day before the arrival of which we will steadily refuse all food, and so by degrees, as we learn to bear it, extend that hour further and further on. Such little plans as these may be innocently devised by each of us; and a little success in them, however small they may be as beginnings, will surely lead us on by degrees to the end we have in view.*

* The great question with many who have the sincerest desire to bring themselves into conformity with the ancient discipline of fasting, is this: How far it is right to weaken the body, so as to incapacitate it for other duties; or how far it is right, in case of natural disease or want of physical power, to pursue such a system as may destroy health? Certainly the system of fasting was very severe in the ancient Church; and in our own Church, the homily on fasting sets forth the same severity. As, for instance:

"Fasting, even by Christ's assent, is a *withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food, from the body, for the determined time of fasting.* And that it was used in the Primitive Church appeareth most evidently by the Chalcedon Council, one of the four first general Councils. The Fathers assembled there, to the number of six hundred and thirty, considering with themselves how acceptable a thing fasting is to God, when it is used according to His word,—again, having before their eyes also the great abuses of the same crept into the Church at those days through the negligence of them which should have taught the people the right use thereof, and by vain glosses, devised of men: to reform the said abuses, and to restore this so good and godly a work to the true use thereof, decreed in that Council *that every person, as well in his private as publick fast, should continue all day without meat and drink till after the evening prayer.* And whosoever did eat or drink before the evening prayer was ended, should be accounted and reputed not to consider the purity of this fast. This canon teaches so evidently how fasting was used in the Primitive Church, as by words it cannot be more plainly expressed. Fasting then, by the decree of those six hundred and thirty Fathers, grounding their determination in this matter upon the Sacred Scriptures and long-continued usage or practice both of the prophets and other godly persons before the coming of Christ, and also of the Apostles and other devout men in the New Testament, is *a withholding of meat, drink, and all natural food, from the body, for the determined time of Fasting.*"—*Homily of Fasting.*

But still, for the comfort of the weak and sickly, and for the in-

Let no one treat these things as trifling or unimportant. Let no one, on the principle of *evils* being possibly attached to the practice of fasting, therefore repudiate it. Evils there will of necessity be, by the imperfection of human nature, capable of being attached to every devout practice. In prayer itself, our Lord cautions us against an abuse of it. Therefore, that there should be dangers and abuses in fasting ought not to surprise us. Suffer me to add a caution against these errors, so that knowing them, each may perceive the want of cogency in the objections.

struction of those whose bodily labours of necessity require sustenance, it may be observed that all the ancient writers of the Church prescribe *moderation*, and say that it is by no means necessary in all cases to adhere so strictly to the usual rules. Two sermons on fasting have lately been published by the Hon. and Rev. A. P. Perceval, in a note to which he appends many quotations from the Fathers, to urge moderation for those of delicate constitution. I will select one or two:

S. Chrysostom.—"Fasting is a medicine: but the most valuable medicine may be rendered useless through want of skill in him that uses it; for it is necessary to know the proper time and the proper quantity, which, if they be not considered, it will prove injurious."

S. Basil.—"By *excessive* fasting we are rendered less apt for our work. What then is to be done? Shall we hinder our work for the sake of fasting, or slight fasting for the sake of the work? We ought to observe both fasting and feeding with reason, the necessary companion of piety."

S. Jerome.—"Use fasting in that measure which you are able to bear. We do not enjoin immoderate fasting, and enormous abstinence from food, by which delicate persons have their health injured. It is the sentence of the philosophers that virtue consists in moderation, and excess of manner or measure is accounted among crimes..... for I have known some of both sexes who have had the soundness of their brain affected by excessive fastings, so that they knew not what they did, or whither to turn themselves, or when it behoved them to speak, or when to be silent."

Again: "Long and immoderate fasts are wrong, especially in the young. Let your fast be pure, simple, moderate, but not superstitious. Nor, if you fast two or three days, count yourself better than those who do not fast."

While, then, we should be cautious lest we bring ourselves within the limit of such indulgences *unnecessarily*,—while we honestly do fast to the best of our ability, and, as it were by little and little, educate ourselves in fasting,—still such opinions as the above will direct us rightly as to the extent to which we may, under any special circumstances, carry this discipline.

First, then, if we were to fast *to be seen of men*, the mischief would be far greater than the benefit, and we had better then omit it, even as our Lord says: "Anoint thy head and wash thy face, that thou *appear not unto men* to fast".

Secondly, if we were to consider it as in any degree a meritorious action, either retrospectively making amends for past sins, or in prospect earning for us a place in God's estimation,—then it would cease to be beneficial, because, being no longer an *instrument* for holiness, it would be practised as holiness itself. We should come under the censure of our Lord, as did the Pharisee who said, in praise of himself: "I fast twice in the week".

Again, if we were to imagine that we should fulfil the duty of fasting by a mere change of diet,—forsaking one sort of food, and taking up another,—substituting, for instance, fish for flesh, and yet, notwithstanding the change, continuing fully to gratify the bodily appetite as before,—such would be a most ridiculous pretence, and, forfeiting all the end of the supposed fast, would leave us just as we were, without a single step in self-denial gained. It is the inward mind and spirit which, by the external act, we desire to purify and subdue; and this cannot be affected by one sort of meat or another. And so S. Augustin says: "I fear not uncleanness of meat, but uncleanness of lusting; I know that Noah was permitted to eat all kind of flesh that was good for food,—that Elijah was fed with flesh,—that John, endued with an admirable abstinence, was not polluted by feeding on living creatures—locusts. I know also that Esau was deceived by lusting for lentils, and that David blamed himself for desiring a draught of water, and that Our King was tempted, not concerning flesh, but bread. And therefore the people in the wilderness also deserved to be reproved, not for desiring flesh, but because in the desire of flesh, they murmured against the Lord."*

Again, if we were to imagine that fasting consisted in a mere abstinence from food, yet fancied withal

* Augustin. Confess. book x, § 46.

that other indulgences might be simultaneously sought after,—such as the ball-room, the theatre, or other either secular or criminal pursuits—then the end of fasting would be lost, and having ceased to be an instrument of the spirit, it would be worse than valueless. Thus S. Chrysostom says in his Lent sermons: "What profit is it to fast, and eat nothing all the day, if you give yourself to playing at dice and other vain pastimes, and spend the whole day many times in perjuries and blasphemies? The true fast is abstinence from vices. For abstinence from meat was appointed upon this occasion, that we should curb the tone of our flesh, and make the horse obedient to his rider. He that fasts ought above all things to bridle his anger, to learn meekness and clemency, to have a contrite heart, to banish the thoughts of all inordinate desires, to set the watchful eye of God before his eyes, and His uncorrupted judgment; to set himself above riches, and exercise great liberality in giving of alms, and to expel every evil thought. This is the true fast".* How readily we are referred from this to the passage of Isaiah (chap. lvii.) beginning: "Wherefore have we fasted, say they, and thou seest not?" And the indignant reply of the Lord God: "Is it such a fast that I have chosen?—a day for a man to afflict his soul?.....Is not this the fast that I have chosen, to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal the bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him, and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?"†

* Chrys. Hom. vi, in Gen. p. 60.

† The performance of deeds of mercy,—almsgiving, visiting the sick, and the like,—are continually urged, in correspondence with the passage of Isaiah, as necessary accompaniments of fasting.

S. Austin says: "Before all things on our fasting days, what we were used to spend upon our dinner, let us bestow upon the poor."—*Aug. Serm.* 56.

Chrysologus says: "Mercy and piety are the wings of fasting, by which it mounts up to heaven, and without which it lies dead upon the earth.—Therefore, when we fast, let us lay up our dinner in the

Once more—to take an error on the opposite side—suppose we were to imagine that fasting was a mere spiritual abstraction, not a real bodily duty, arguing with ourselves thus: True, fasting *is* mentioned by our Lord as a Christian duty. It certainly *is* desired by our Church; but then it is absurd and contrary to Christ to think that anything bodily can please God. Fasting, therefore, in the Scripture, must mean "*spiritual fasting*". In answer to such pleading as this, it would be necessary to say, that such an expression would be a mere confusion of terms. It is a mere piece of sophistry to use such language as "*spiritual* fasting". Let us try it by some analogous duty. Suppose the beggar in the street were to urge his petition for alms, and you, looking on, were to say, "True, I know almsgiving is mentioned in Scripture as a duty; but then the mere giving of money cannot be meant, for that is a mere external action, referring to the body. It must be *spiritual* almsgiving that is meant. Let me say to the poor man, 'Be thou clothed', and 'Be thou warm', and 'Be thou filled'. Let me wish it *in the spirit*, and then I shall be giving alms according to God's will". Would not

hands of the poor. The hands of the poor are the treasury of Christ. Fasting without mercy is an image of famine. Fasting without works of piety is only an occasion of covetousness; because, by such sparing, what is taken from the body only swells in the purse."—*Chrysol. Serm.* 8 *de Jejun.* apud Bingham.

Another saying of S. Augustine is this: "Fasting without almsgiving is a lamp without oil."

Hermas Pastor says: "A true fast is not merely to keep under the body, but to give to the widow and the poor the amount of that which thou wouldest have spent upon thyself."

S. Chrysostom says, in reference to those whose delicate health will not enable them to fast: "He, therefore, who eats food, and is not able to fast, let him give more alms, be more fervent in prayers, have more readiness in hearing the word of God; to all which things his weakness of body will offer no impediment."—*Hom.* 10 *in Genesis I.*

There are many such passages, all confirming each other, and suggesting with Isaiah the test of a true fast. On this ground, it appears that a collection from the people at the offertory on Ash Wednesday, for the sick and needy, for some hospital or house of mercy, would be an addition to our service on that day, in true accordance with the Church, and acceptable in the sight of God, as joined with our holy fast.

the extreme absurdity of such a notion be palpable? But it is no otherwise in fasting. This is a duty whose essence is in the affliction of the body in reference to self, as almsgiving is a duty whose essence is in the relieving of the body in regard to others. It must of necessity be accompanied, in order to its perfection, with a spiritual intention, and a spiritual object,—as set forth in the passage from Isaiah above quoted (Isaiah lvii.); but it is the shallowest of sophisms to put the accompaniment for the essence, the end for the means. We may understand "spiritual joy", "spiritual grief", "spiritual prayer", as being duties essentially *in the mind;* but let us beware, as of a mere delusion, the excuse of a self-indulgent or indolent heart, when any say, that *spiritual* fasting is all that GOD would have.

And now have I said all that seems needful upon the Church's doctrines of holy seasons, both festival and fast. That the observations which have been made will be considered by some in these days as tending to Romanism, I am quite prepared to hear.* But what was said in the case of ceremonies will apply here again. And I must

* "He that undertakes to enumerate the benefits of fasting, may also reckon all the benefits of physic; for fasting is not to be commended as a duty, but as an instrument; and, in that sense, no man can reprove it, or undervalue it, but he that knows neither spiritual acts nor spiritual necessities. But, by the doctors of the Church, it is called the *nourishment of prayer*, the *restraint of lust*, the *wings of the soul*, the *diet of angels*, the *instrument of humility and self-denial*, the *purification of the spirit;* and the paleness and meagreness of visage which is consequent to the daily fast of great mortifiers is, by S. Basil, said to be the mark in the forehead which the angel observed, when he signed the saints in the forehead, to escape the wrath of God. The soul that is greatly vexed, which goeth stooping and feeble, and the eyes that fail, and the hungry soul, shall give thee praise and righteousness, O Lord."

This passage is from Bishop Jeremy Taylor. I have selected it, because I do not think any one could be found speaking in higher,—one might almost say, in more enthusiastic terms, of the blessing of fasting. Yet this bishop was no great favourer of Popery,—having written volumes to oppose it, and being one of those writers to whom we should most confidently appeal in defence of our Church against Rome. There is little reason, therefore, in *reality*, to fear those who would say, that to advocate fasting is to advocate Romanism.

ever reply—that, in all *good* things, the more nearly the two Churches coincide the better. It is only in the excess that we shrink from identifying ourselves with Rome, not in the truth. Happy indeed would it be, were that excess taken away, and the two Churches could yet again be one. This is a prayer which no good Catholic would hesitate to make. But such an end is as yet hopeless. We, however, of the Catholic Church of Christ in England, have nothing to do but obey that Church, as displaying her will in her Book of Common Prayer. If the calendars and tables, as we have now examined them, do set forth days of fasting,—days of fasting must be intended to be observed; and the doctrine of fasting, however Romish, is yet English also. Take up the Prayer Book:—You find that the great bulk of it is occupied by special collects, gospels and epistles, for days of festival and days of fasting. Observe the collect for Ash Wednesday. Shall we, on that day of mourning and sorrow for sin, solemnly be gathered together, and invoke God, and say, "We turn unto Thee, O God, in FASTING", yet carry on our lives immediately after in contradiction of those solemn words,—making no difference in our food,—no difference in our society,—no difference in our pleasures? Shall we have prayed, in the collect of the first Sunday in Lent, that in imitation of our blessed Saviour's fast of forty days and forty nights, we might "use such abstinence that the flesh may be subdued to the spirit", and yet withal attempt no abstinence, but, on the contrary, indulge in delicate viands, and pamper our appetites, and seek for rich clothing, and gay apparel, and festive meetings, just as before? Common consistency (on *reflection*) must put an end to this. *Lent does mean something.* What does it mean? Let each man answer for himself. May God of His infinite mercy send us the truth, and teach us aright!

One thing is certain. As, standing by a river-bank, we gaze upon the stream beneath, and to our vision, however keen, its glassy surface seems ever the same,—and yet not for one instant *is* it the same, but ever hurries on to bury itself in the distant ocean undiscerned,—so is it with the Church's holy times. Feast and fast succeed, but we can

fix our vision nowhere. It seems alike, but never *is* alike. Let the old cast back their minds on *their* seasons of Lent, and Passion-tide, and Easter, as in youth they thought of them. On what year can they fix? On none. It is as the post that hasteth by, or as the arrow that cleaveth the air. Its place is nowhere. All they know is, that they have been hurried on, until they are where they are; and they cannot tell *how* they are here,—but they *are* here. Lord's day after Lord's day,—vigil after vigil,—fast after fast,—Lent after Lent,—onward they come in one continual round, and so they draw near to the end of all,—that end when all our days and months, our collects and our psalms, our prayers and our litanies, our rejoicing and our fasting, shall issue in that glorious yet terrible appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ at the throne of His judgment. Let me remind you, my brethren, that the Church, faithful to her solemn duty, *spares you not*, neither speaks *soft words* to you, nor heeds whether you be rich or whether you be poor, but treats you as alike sinners and wretched before God; and bids you reflect that, by the course of her year, you are drawing nearer and nearer to HIM,—closer and closer to the judgment of that book in which your days are all recorded, and from which your sentence shall go forth,—either, "Well done, good and faithful servant", or, "Depart from me, ye wicked."

SERMON IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF HOLY PLACES.

2 CHRONICLES vi, 2.

"*I have built an house of habitation for Thee, and a place for Thy dwelling for ever.*"

WHEN Jacob went on his way from Beersheba towards Haran, he lighted on a certain place, and tarried there all night. He took of the stones of that place, and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that place to sleep. And he dreamed; and his vision was: "A ladder set upon the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven; and behold, the angels of God ascending and descending on it. And behold, the Lord stood above it." This vision signified the doctrine of HOLY PLACES.

First, the vision signified the *use* of holy places, namely, PRAYER; for the ladder set upon the earth, and angels ascending, would represent men's prayers,—those angels or messengers of the mind going up to God; and the angels descending would signify God's merciful answers to prayer coming down to refresh men's weary spirits, and sustain them in their worldly trials and toils. But secondly, the vision signified—as the event proved—that places of prayer are holy, for there were stones piled up, and a pillar made,—*a building*. "Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillows, and set it up for a pillar, and *poured oil upon the top of it*." The pouring of oil was an act of consecration. And thirdly, the vision signified that God's presence in a particular manner blesses and makes reverend, and in some

degree fearful, the places of His worship; for Jacob said, when he awoke: "Surely the Lord is in this place and I knew it not. How dreadful is this place. This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven."

Such is the first account that Holy Scripture gives us of a *house of God*. Previous indeed to this, we find altars spoken of, and sacrifices, as in the case of Abel and Noah; but the piling up of stones constituting a pillar gives us the first notion of a *building*,—the first notion of its *use*, the first notion of its *consecration*,—the first notion of its *blessing*, by the presence of God.

But that which is here shadowed out in Jacob's vision, was made afterwards an express law of Almighty God. It may in Jacob's case be considered but as a dream or allegory; but still it is the germ of that principle by which we afterwards see the temple of Solomon to have been dedicated to the service of God. It shall be my endeavour now to trace this out; first showing what are the precepts of God in the Old Testament, in regard to holy places; then showing their adoption into Christianity; and thirdly, the manner in which our own Church desires them, by her Book of Common Prayer, to be observed at this day. All this will follow from the rubrical direction which stands immediately before the service of Morning Prayer, from which I take the subject of this lecture,—the Doctrine of Holy Places. Let us turn to our Prayer-Book. Thus it speaks:

The Order for Morning and Evening Prayer, daily to be said and used throughout the Year.

The Morning and Evening Prayer shall be used in the accustomed Place of the Church, Chapel, or Chancel; except it shall be otherwise determined by the Ordinary of the Place. And the Chancels shall remain as they have done in times past.

"Solemn duties of public service to be done unto God must have their places set and prepared in such sort as beseemeth actions of that regard." Such is the principle

laid down by Hooker ; and by him it is traced even further than the instance of Jacob to which I have alluded. It is traced to Adam; for "Adam", he says, "even during the space of his small continuance in Paradise, had where to present himself before the Lord ; and Adam's sons had, out of Paradise, in like sort whither to bring their sacrifices." And from Noah and his sons retaining the tradition from Adam, and, after the flood, going forth to people the whole earth, no doubt the general idea prevailed, even among the heathen world, of temples, hallowed groves, shrines, altars, and the like. There is, in fact, no religion, however debased, but is full of the doctrine of holy places. The elaborate architecture of Greece and Rome, as well as the rude pile of Stonehenge in Britain,—the consecrated oak of the Druid, as well as the gorgeous temple of the Hindoo and the mosque of the follower of Mahomet,—all testify to this leading idea of setting apart a place for the special presence of the Being whom they worship.

But let us go at once to the law of God. In the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus, Moses is solemnly called by Jehovah to enter into conference with Him. The glory of the Lord appeared on the mountain, and a cloud covered it six days. On the seventh day he called unto Moses out of the cloud, and Moses there remaining forty days and forty nights, received the most minute directions as to the construction and preparation of holy places. After speaking in many details of the materials to be used in its construction, God said : "And let them make me a sanctuary that I may dwell among them" (Exodus xxv, 8). After this, mention is made of the tabernacle, and the ark of shittim wood, and the mercy seat, and the cherubims, and the altar,—different parts in the construction of this sanctuary. The ark was a chest or holy vessel, in which were to be laid up certain treasures as memorials of God's dealing with the Jewish people,—namely, the two tables of the Law, Aaron's rod that budded, the golden pot of manna, and the like. The tabernacle was a sort of tent capable of being taken down and moved from place to place, to suit the Jewish people, who were then wandering in the wilderness. The ark was placed within the taber-

nacle, and over the ark was the mercy seat. From the mercy seat, so especially prepared, God promised to vouchsafe His personal guidance and teaching to the people. These are His words: "There I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims, which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." It is this tabernacle or sanctuary [holy place] which David on a subsequent occasion called "*The House of God*"; and he says: "Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy house, and the place were Thine honour dwelleth." "How amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord of Hosts." "I was glad when they said unto me, we will go into the house of the Lord."

But when time advanced, and the Jewish people, instead of being a wandering and unsettled people in the wilderness, became a powerful and a royal nation,—then it seemed fit to build a more permanent House of God. The former house had been merely a moveable tent; but "Solomon built Him an HOUSE". In the fifth and following chapter of 1 Kings you will find an ample description of that most glorious and magnificent work, the Temple of Solomon. No money was spared in its erection. No time, no labour, no expense, was thought too much, to make that building the most magnificent that had ever been erected on earth. And it *was* the most magnificent. "Cedar trees from Lebanon, brought down from Hiram, king of Tyre, by ten thousand men working by courses; and great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones, to lay the foundation of the house. He overlaid the house with pure gold, and the whole altar that was by the oracle he overlaid with pure gold; and he carved all the walls round about with carved figures of cherubims, and palm trees, and open flowers; and the house was filled with great works of brass and of silver, and of gold, such as no man had ever seen before." Such is the Scriptural description. But let me ask,—on what principle was all this done? Why was so much money spent on this building? Why did David make such great preparations, and Solomon take so many years

to build it? Simply for this reason,—it was GOD'S HOUSE. It was not a house for *man*, it was not a house for common and ordinary things; but for *religion*, for *prayer*, for *praise*, and *worshipping* GOD. But above all, it was a place, just as Jacob had said in his dream,—*a dreadful place*,—a place where God Himself spiritually dwelt,—a place into which He came to hear men's prayers, and to receive men's praises. Surely so it was. Observe the words of prayer in which Solomon consecrated his house to God,—offered it to Him,—and made it HIS. Observe also what took place,—thus we read in Scripture: "It came to pass when the priests were come out of the holy place, that the cloud filled the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister because of the cloud, for the *glory of the* LORD *had filled the house of the Lord*."

But let us enter now still further into the history of the Jews. It did not follow that because they built (under their kings, Solomon and David) this beautiful house, that therefore they were to remain a good and holy people for ever. Alas, no! The devotion of Solomon did not attach either to his successors in the throne or to their people, for any great period of their history. They soon forgot God, and started aside like a broken bow, and became disobedient and wicked idolators, worshipping Baal and other heathen gods, instead of the true Jehovah. In consequence of this, God withdrew from them. In consequence of this, they suffered captivity for seventy years under Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon,—their city was destroyed,—their temple, so beautiful and glorious, in which God had dwelt, was razed to the ground, and became a heap of ruins.

Still, however, when they had been sufficiently punished, a portion of them returned. Under Ezra they were suffered to go back to Jerusalem, and become a people again. Then what took place? The same principle of building God's house was again reverted to. They restored the Temple; or rather, they built a new one, and it was again solemnly dedicated to God. They did not contemplate the possibility of having a religion without a temple. This

house of God was not indeed, in many respects, so beautiful as the former, but in one respect it was greater,—for into it was brought our Saviour Jesus Christ, when He was a little child; and there it was that HE, when He was grown up to be a man, and had taken upon Himself the office of Messiah,—there it was that He stood, when He rebuked with such indignation the buyers and sellers. He Himself called that temple, as built and dedicated to God, "*His Father's House*", just as Jacob had called the pillar of stones, and Solomon his first temple, GOD'S *house*. And because the Jews had profaned it,—because they forgot its sacred uses,—because, instead of venerating it as peculiarly God's own house, they came to transact their worldly business in it,—and spoke, and thought, and acted in it, as though it were nothing more than a common house,—because of all this (and I do beseech you to observe what the words of our Saviour were, standing in the temple, when He saw this): "Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold doves; and said unto them—It is written, my house shall be called *the house of prayer*, but ye have made it a den of thieves."

In addition to this main feature of the Jewish worship,—the temple—we find two other classes of buildings set apart for devotional purposes,—the synagogue and the proseuche. The word synagogue merely conveys the notion of a place where people assemble together; the proseuche means a place of prayer. The former was used for public worship on the ordinary Sabbath days; the latter was more of a private character, and was built on the banks of rivers or by the sea-side. In the time of our Saviour, synagogues abounded; and He, by His presence in them, and by taking part in the worship performed in them, gave a sanction to their use as public places of prayer,—houses of God; and confirmed what He had already done in the temple. In the thirteenth chapter of S. Matthew, we find that "He taught them in their synagogues." In the fourth chapter of S. Luke, that "as His custom was, He went into the synagogue on the Sabbath

day, and stood up for to read." In the eighteenth chapter of S. John, Christ Himself speaks of the synagogue and temple together as the scenes of His teaching, saying :— "I ever taught in the synagogue and in the temple."

The synagogue was a plain building, not restricted to any particular shape, but generally built upon an elevation, and roofed in, wherein it differed from the proseuche, which was open to the air. Along the walls were great chairs raised upon a platform, in which the doctors and elders of the people took their seats. Under these was another row of seats, for persons of inferior quality ; and below these, another row, for the youngest and poorest. These lower seats were appropriated to those who were being educated for the priesthood, or for the Jewish law. Thus we read of S. Paul "sitting at the feet of Gamaliel". It is to these high seats of the doctors that our Lord so frequently alludes, in rebuking the pride of the Pharisees. When thus seated, they were elevated above the rest, so as to be conspicuous ; and our Lord says (Matt. xxiii. 6): "All their works they do to be seen of men. They love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the *chief seats in the synagogues.*" And again in S. Luke (xx. 46); "Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and love greetings in the market-places, and *the highest seats in the synagogues.*"*

* It is generally supposed that the use of synagogues among the Jews did not commence until after the Jewish captivity. The rule was, that a synagogue should be erected in every place where there were ten persons of full age, who might be reasonably reckoned upon as attending daily to form a congregation. Without a congregation of ten persons at the least, the synagogue service could not be performed. At first the synagogues were few, but afterwards they increased to a very great extent. Tiberias alone, in the time of our Lord, had twelve synagogues ; and Jerusalem, four hundred and eighty. See Prideaux's *Connection*, book vi. There were also, in addition to the synagogues, as mentioned in the text, the proseuchæ. The synagogue was within the walls of the city; the proseuche without the walls, and most frequently by the side of rivers. Thus it is supposed by some writers that the passage in S. Luke (vi, 12): "He went out into a mountain to pray, and continued all night in prayer to God," might be better rendered : "and continued all night in a proseuche of God," the word signifying prayer. In the same manner at Philippi, the place by the river-side where prayer was

Thus then we see from Holy Scripture,—first in the law of Moses, then in the history of the Jews, and subsequently in the life of our Lord,—that the custom of setting apart places as holy, and dedicated to God's worship, was ever a part of the faith of God's ancient people. We also see that our Lord Himself, by His example, confirms this practice as one conformable to sound and true religion. Our business next will be to turn from the Jewish dispensation to the Christian, and endeavour to see what was the case with the first disciples of our blessed Lord—what was the case with those early Churches founded either by the Apostles, or by men immediately succeeding them.

At first, indeed, a very different scene presents itself to our view,—very different from the sumptuous magnificence of the temple, or even the order and solemnity of the synagogue. For many long years, the Christian could only

wont to be made is supposed to be a proseuche. Josephus speaks of them as by the sea-side: "We decree that the Jews, according to the Jewish law, both men and women, should build a proseuche by the sea-side, according to the custom of their country." The name was still preserved among Christians, and the churches were often called proseucteria, which is the same word, signifying houses of prayer, or oratories; but they differed from the larger churches, inasmuch as they were confined to the purposes of prayer, and were never permitted to be used in the celebration of the eucharist or other sacred mystery. See *Bingham*, bk. viii, § 4. Macknight observes, that the difference between a proseuche and a synagogue was this: The synagogue was a covered house, where the law was read, and prayers offered up to God in a set form, in the name of the whole congregation; but the proseuche or oratory was a piece of ground enclosed with a wall, where individuals prayed each by himself apart, as in the courts of the temple. The Jews built their synagogues and proseuchæ on the banks of rivers, or on the seashore, because, according to the tradition of the fathers, they were obliged to wash their hands before they prayed, for which use they esteemed the rivers and sea-water by far the fittest.—Macknight, *Life of the Apostle Paul, Proofs and Illustrations*, No. xix.

Juvenal alludes to the proseuche:

"In quâ te quæro proseuchâ." —*Sat.* III, 296.

It may as well be added that the synagogue worship differed from that of the temple, inasmuch as no sacrifices were performed in the synagogue, and that the males of every tribe and place were obliged to resort to the temple three times every year, notwithstanding there might be synagogues in their town. See Lardner's *Credibility*, book i, chapter ix, § 6.

profess his faith in fear and persecution. So great was the hatred with which first the Jew, and then the heathen, pursued every disciple of the Cross, that the commonest assembly of the faithful was held in secret and by stealth. Still, however, we can trace in the Acts of the Apostles the practice of meeting together, and of dedicating a place, as best they might, to public prayer. Our Lord is described as meeting, with his few chosen disciples, in an upper room. When about to celebrate the passover for the last time, and to change it for ever into that holy commemoration of His own sufferings, the Lord's Supper,—it was in an upper room that He assembled them together. (Mark xiv, 15). From this time the upper room, the *hyperoon* or *cœnaculum*, seems to have been assumed as the Christian place of worship. Thus we continually find it. In the twentieth chapter of S. John, we read of the disciples meeting together on the Lord's day, and it seems to have been in this upper room; for it is described (verse 19) "that the doors were shut when the disciples were assembled, for fear of the Jews". The first time at which they met after their Divine Master's ascension, it was in an upper room: "When they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter....." And then naming the other apostles, it is said: "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with His brethren." Again, on the day of Pentecost, the disciples are described as being "all with one accord *in one place*". And when S. Paul came to Troas (Acts xx,) in his way to Philippi: "The disciples came together on the first day of the week to break bread, and Paul preached to them ready to depart on the morrow; and there were many lights in the *upper chamber*, where they were gathered together." Some learned men go further than this, and say that even in some instances this upper room, or whatever might have been the place of assembly, is called by S. Paul "a Church", quoting the passage 1 Cor. xi, 22: "Have ye not houses to eat and drink in, or despise ye the Church of God?"* And again, it is said that

* This is founded on the comments of S. Chrysostom, Theophy-

the word mentioned in James ii, 2, and translated "*assembly*", means a Christian church. The word is synagogue: "If there come into your synagogue a man with a gold ring". Further, S. Paul says (Heb. x, 25): "Not forsaking the assembling of yourselves together". The original is "synagogue", which might be taken to mean the *place* of assembly, as well as the act of assembling. And lastly, we have a full recognition of the fact of some public place being appointed and set apart for divine worship, in the directions which the same apostle gives in the fourteenth chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians. He there speaks of "prophesying" (which means preaching), of "edification",—of using "a known tongue"; and He says: "Yet *in the church* I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that by my voice I might teach others also, than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue". And again in the twenty-third verse it is said: "If therefore the whole Church come together *in one place*". And then again, the church or place of assembly, is compared as a *public place*, with home: "Let your women keep silence *in the churches*.....If they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands *at home*, for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church."

Such is very nearly all that can be said in regard to Christian places of assembly in the first ages of the Church;

lact and others, on the text in question. The "upper room" so often mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, where the Apostles were assembled when the Holy Ghost came upon them (*Acts* ii),—where our Saviour celebrated His last supper,—where He appeared to His disciples upon two successive Sundays after His resurrection (*John* xx),—the place where the seven deacons were elected and ordained (*Acts* vi),—where the first council of Jerusalem was held (*Acts* xv), which place was afterwards enclosed with a goodly church, called the Church of Mount Sion, and the Upper Church of the Apostles, in the time of Cyril: this was the οἶκος, or house of assembly, mentioned *Acts* ii, 46. Such is Mede's opinion, quoted by Bingham; and he thinks—so far does he proceed in the notion that Christian Churches existed even in the Apostles' time—he thinks that the words ἐν οἴκῳ ought not to be translated "from house to house," but "in the house," or place where the assembly used to meet together. If this be the case, then the whole notion of a perfect Christian Church as a place of worship in the Apostles' times, is precise and determined.

but when it is considered, as before observed, that in such ages of persecution any public assertion of the faith of the Cross was impossible, it ceases to be a wonder that so little is said upon the subject. When it was certain death to profess the name of Christ,—when the Jews themselves, in many cases erroneously identified with the Christians, became looked upon as common enemies by the whole heathen world,—when we hear of the greatest and most holy bishops being brought before heathen magistrates, and the choice given them either of worshipping an idol, or being cast to the wild beasts of the amphitheatre,—when we hear of men, women and children, being hunted down and put to the sword merely for professing the faith of the Cross,—we cannot wonder that the erection of public buildings does not find a mention in the history of the first centuries. But still, all along, in the midst of all that was fearful, the *principle* was kept alive, in the woods or deserts, the holes and caverns of the earth, the early Christians would still meet, and call the place a church,—they would still break bread and pray. "Every place", says one of the early writers, "whither our persecution leads us, becomes our *temple*, and we hold our assemblies there,—a field or a desolate wood, a ship, an inn, or a prison."

But no sooner did persecution die away,—no sooner did the *power* arise, than the will immediately unfolded itself; and the principle long treasured up, of adoring God in temples suited to His glory, burst out into action. The fourth century saw a Roman emperor become a disciple of the Cross. Then, freedom being given, churches began to arise. It was in the time of Constantine that the first Christian church was built. In Jerusalem and Antioch, and other cities where Christians abounded, holy buildings suited to their worship arose. At Constantinople, a church was built called "Ecclesia Constantiniana", to the memory of the twelve apostles. It was built at the emperor's charge. Eusebius describes it as "vastly high, having its walls covered with marble, its roof overlaid with gold, and the outside, instead of tiles, covered with gilded brass."*

* Eusebius, de Vitâ Constant. lib. iv, c. 58.

Others soon followed; and not only were new buildings erected, but also heathen temples and Jewish synagogues were converted into Christian churches. Wherever the religion of Christ was free and open, there immediately appeared, as its sign and type, a church. The erection of a church became the object of every wealthy and pious Christian, and money was not wanting, nor art or skill in architecture deficient, towards raising throughout every country in Christendom suitable temples for the worship of God.*

Thus much then for the propriety and early custom of having holy places set apart for religion. I must now

* But we must not indulge in any notion that in England our cathedrals and abbeys sprung forth *at once* into all the grandeur in which they now stand before us. The churches at first were (although built with the very best heart) still but poor structures. They improved, as skill in architecture increased; and like all other things, attained their present proud position only by length of time. If we read the description of the first English churches, we shall probably be surprised both as to the dimensions and the materials.

"There was a time, Bede tells us, when there was not a stone church in all the land, but the custom was to build them all of wood. And therefore when Bishop Ninias built a church of stone, it was such a rarity and unusual thing among the Britons, that they called the place Candida Casa, Whitern, or Whitchurch."—(Bede, lib. iii, c. 4, § 25, apud Bingham.) The same author tells us that "Finans, the second bishop of Lindisfarne or Holy Island, since called the bishopric of Durham, built a church in the island fit for a cathedral see, which yet was not of stone, but only timber, sawed, and covered with reed; and so it continued till Eadbert, the seventh bishop, took away the reed, and covered it all over, both roof and sides, with sheets of lead." No one after this will wonder at the account which Sulpitius Severus gives of the churches of Cyrene in the deserts of Libya, when he tells us "he went with a presbyter into one of them, which was made of small rods interwoven one with another, and not much more stately and ambitious than his own house, in which a man could hardly stand upright. But the men who frequented these churches were men of the golden age and purest morals; they neither bought nor sold anything; they knew not what fraud or theft was; they neither had nor desired to have silver or gold, which other mortals set such a value upon. For, says he, when I offered the presbyter ten pieces of gold, he refused them, telling me, with some greatness of mind, that the church was not built with gold, but rather unbuilt by it: Ecclesiam auro non strui, sed potius destrui, altiore consilio potestatus." — *Sulpitius Sever.* Dial. I, c. 2.

endeavour to describe the structure and uses of the early churches. As the Christians of the first ages were men of the closest discipline, carefully guarding the entrance from the world into the church, and exacting of all strict rules of moral behaviour, and rigid adherence to the rule of faith,—moreover, as they were subdivided into many classes, in proportion to their advancement in Church-membership, and as their passage from one class to another was marked by various privileges which were gained only by great vigilance and care,—so we find in the structure of the outward building of a church a corresponding care in the allotment of different divisions, and a minute jealousy of the parts and privileges of each several place. To all this, our present careless and promiscuous assemblies in divine worship are entire strangers; but it is curious to observe how closely the building of a church as a Christian place of assembly, runs parallel with discipline in morals, and integrity in the faith. The names of a church in early times seem to have been various: ecclesia, domus ecclesiæ, domus divina, domus columbæ, προσευκτηρια, basilica, and so forth; which may be translated,—the assembly, house of assembly, the divine house, the house of the dove (the Holy Spirit), the house of prayer, the royal house. But perhaps of all other names, the two most in use were,—Dominica, the Lord's house; or in Greek, κυριακη. Dominica is a title which appertains to many things connected with Christianity,—as the "Lord's day" and the "Lord's supper"; and we trace the use of this word in our own calendar at the present day in "the *Dominical* letter", or Lord's day letter. But our own name of "church" is no doubt derived from the Greek κυριακη, which is easily formed into kurik, kirk, or church. In the general shape of the building, there was at first no particular rule followed; because from the conversion of the heathen temples into churches, any alteration in the general form would have been impossible; but when new churches were built, they were generally in the form of a cross,—sometimes in the shape of a ship,—and sometimes, though not very frequently, round. The entrance was towards the west; and the sanctuary, or altar, towards the east. The divi-

sions of the church were three. I. First, the *narthex*,* or ante-temple,—a sort of cloister, of a reed-like shape, forming the entrance. In this outer portion, according to the discipline which I just spoke of, would stand the penitents of the first and second order, and the catechumens; those who were either seeking admittance into the Church, and undergoing catechetical instruction previous to baptism,—or those who had been cast out of the Church for sin, and were undergoing the first degrees of penance, preparatory to their restoration. These classes filled the lower or outward portion of the church. II. The second great division of the church was the *naos* or nave; in point of space, its principal division. In the lower extremity of the nave would be placed the penitents of the third order, —that is, those who had made more advance in their restoration to the Church, and were so allowed to enter the church, though not to remain through all the prayers. Then above these would stand the penitents of the fourth order,—those who had made a still further progress in restoration, but still not allowed to make an oblation, or to join in the service of the altar. Then above these again would stand the communicants, the pure and full members of the

* If it be enquired, why this part of the church was called narthex, I answer, because the figure of it was supposed to resemble a ferula, which was the Latin name for it,—that is, a rod or staff. For any oblong figure, or dromical, as the Greeks call it, was by them called a narthex. And therefore this part of the church being a long but narrow part across the front of the church, was termed narthex, or ferula, on that account: And it is further to be observed, that some churches had three or four nartheces, but those without the walls; for the porticos or cloisters of such churches as Sancta Sophia, which were built to the north, and west, and south of them, were called nartheces, because they were long narrow buildings, in figure or shape of a narthex. And such churches had no other narthex within the walls.—These porticos were the proper station of the penitents, and such others as were not allowed to come within the nave of the church. But in such churches as had no porticos adjoining to them, the narthex was the lower part of the church within the walls, which was made to answer the use of porticos in other churches. And this seems to be the true state of the matter, and the only way to reconcile the different accounts that are given by authors of the ancient narthex of the church.—*Bingham*, book viii, chapter iv, § 6.

Church. The building was also divided in this portion as to sexes, the women standing on one side, and the men on the other; the separation was usually made by wooden rails. III. The third division of the church was called the *bema*, containing the altar and the sanctuary, or most holy place. It was called bema, from its steps of ascent, this part of the church always standing higher than the rest. Laymen and women were not to enter this part of the church; it was reserved entirely for the clergy, and therefore bore the name of *adytum;* sometimes also *θυσιαστηριον*, the altar, or place of sacrifice; sometimes the *αγιον*, or sacrarium, *the* holy place. Around the altar, which stood some distance from the wall, were placed the seats of the clergy. The extreme end was generally round, in the shape of a shell, and therefore called "concha bematis", the shell of the bema; the altar standing in the centre, and the bishop's throne and priests' seats around it and behind it. Sometimes this extreme end of the bema was called the apsis. There was another name by which this third division of the church was sometimes designated, and it is that which is most familiar to our ears of the present day, and that is the *chancel*, because it was railed in or separated from the rest of the church by *cancelli*, little rails or banisters; and the remains of these are easily discernible in the rood-screens of the ancient English churches, and in the modern substitute of rails around the altar-table. In the nave or body of the church stood the *ambo*, or reading-desk; not as we place it now, at the end of the church, but in the centre. Near the steps of the chancel stood the *chorus* or choir, the place for the singers and other persons, inferior orders of the clergy, who took part in divine service. Over the altar, which in the first three centuries was commonly of wood, there was generally some sort of canopy or hangings, for the sake of ornament; sometimes the figure of a dove, sometimes the figure of a cross, or other holy emblem of our faith. I must not omit to say that in another part of the church, quite distinct from any yet mentioned, was the baptistery, or place for baptizing. This was not, strictly speaking, in the church itself, but formed an outer building adjoining the church,

containing a well or font. The fonts, in very early times, were curiously wrought with devices and texts from Holy Scripture.

Let us now pass on from this description of the ancient Christian churches to those of our own day. Though we shall find a great deficiency in many particulars, still upon the whole we shall readily trace a considerable likeness. The main features of the general building may be said to be faithfully maintained. But when I speak of "*our own day*", I do not absolutely mean the present day; for, indeed, in some modern churches there is very little trace of the ancient form, any more than there is of the ancient discipline and the ancient devotion; but I speak of our cathedrals and abbeys, and, indeed, of many parish churches built before the Reformation. In these churches we shall generally find the three divisions of which I have spoken faithfully observed, and the general character and spirit of antiquity apparent throughout them. In the first place we have the *narthex* or *portico* at the entrance,—that which we may call the outer portion of the church. In cathedrals, we have it more closely and accurately marked than in parish churches, by the *cloisters*. The cloisters of our cathedrals come very closely to the reed or ferule shape which the narthex describes,—long narrow passages. Then from the portico we pass into the *nave*. This is the great body of the church, in which the congregation, both communicants as well as non-communicants, assemble. Our Church does not now admit that strict discipline in which the ancient Church rejoiced. We have no catechumens, as of old, preparing for their baptism; or penitents, in their different orders, waiting for their restoration to the Church. This division has passed away; and the naves of our church contain one assembled multitude subject to no division, as far as *spiritual* things are concerned. I say, as far as SPIRITUAL things are concerned; for, alas! in *temporal* things we are too much distinguished. The *world* has come into our churches, to mark out too distinctly the RICH and the POOR, where RELIGION only in former times distinguished the holy from the unholy. Now the naves of our churches are too much secularized and defaced by

pews, marking out the wealthy and the great; and open seats, marking out the poor. This distinction cannot surely be good. If we cannot attain to the distinction of the early Christians by things spiritual, we might have less of that which arises from things *temporal*. It surely cannot be defended on any sound religious principle, that in our churches we so constantly violate that remarkable passage in the epistle of S. James: "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons. For if there come unto your assembly [church] a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou there in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou there, and sit here under my footstool; are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?" No, this *cannot be right*. This distinction of the *world* introduced into the house of God *cannot be right*. However it may be explained away,—however excused,—however many difficulties there may be in remedying it,—still as a *system*, being contrary to God's word, it *cannot be right*. No wonder the poor are driven out of our churches to places of dissent. No wonder we see them in such congregations meeting together in conventicles. It is in great measure because they are in our churches so conspicuously marked out, cut off, and divided, by the system of our pews, that they feel a sort of shame in coming. Either let *all* be pews,—let the *poor* have pews as well as the rich;—or let all be open seats,—let the *rich* have open seats as well as the poor. Until one or other of these things is done, I fearlessly assert that the poor, as a class, cannot have the Gospel rightly and fully preached to them. They cannot form that regular and component part of our congregations which, from their numbers and their importance, they have a right to do. We say that the Church of England is the poor man's Church. Never was so great a fallacy. It never can be so, as long as pews remain in churches.*

* No language can be too strong in repudiating this most absurd and un-Catholic practice. One whose loss to the church in these

The third great division of our churches is the *chancel*. This corresponds also with the ancient form. For we have

times is very heavy: one upon whom the grave has but recently closed in the prime of life, has left upon record a protest against pews which it would be well if every holder of a pew would read and think upon.

"Were it not for our early habits, for the mode in which we here in England, and in the nineteenth century, have been trained up, from the days of our earliest Church reminiscences, in the existing system of pews and appropriated sittings; what a strange spectacle would the interior of an English Church, as generally arranged, present to us! And if without the familiarity with it, thus attained, we had been left to form our notions of what the aspect of a Christian Church should be, from sacred writ, and from the general spirit of the faith therein contained, how repulsive, as well as strange would the spectacle appear! We should not wait to form these impressions till we knew on what plan or arrangement the seats were appropriated. The very existence of seats walled round and severed as in separate chambers from each other and from the rest of the building, would suffice to shock us, and to convince us that the spirit which dictated such an arrangement was of a nature very different from any inculcated by the Gospel....The Church bids us enter her sacred walls to offer to God our united service, to offer Him a service which He, we have reason to hope, will accept, because it is united, because we who offer it are one, one not only in heart and soul, but one in real, though invisible unity, as joint members of the ONE BODY, joint partakers of the one bread. We come, if we follow her teaching, to knit yet closer that unity, and to derive each of us, through that unity, an increase of spiritual strength and privileges.

"We come—and the system of our day teaches us—teaches those brethren who come together in token of, and to enjoy the privileges of brotherhood, to accomplish these ends by occupying each for himself and his family some peculiar portion of the sacred area, separating it from the rest by walls, and securing it from intrusion (the intrusion of a Christian penitent coming to kneel beside his fellow sinner) by doors,—doors which if not actually bolted, are yet by custom only to be opened by the occupants of the little chambers within, as a favour. How intensely ridiculous, were not the subject one of such grave importance as to make ridicule unseemly, would be the spectacle of this reciprocal exclusion of each other, and intrenchment of themselves, each in his own little, separate, and pound-like enclosure, by those who profess to walk in the house of God as friends, and to be disciples of Him who laid down his life for us, that we should love one another, as He has loved us. But, alas! it is much more than ridiculous. Creatures of habit as we all are in some decree, influenced in a measure as we must all necessarily be, by the outward forms and aspect of things around us, such an external renunciation of brotherhood in the place where of all others it should

the railings or banisters separating it from the nave, and in some instances we have the rood screen still remaining,

be most especially acknowledged, cannot but have affected the feeling of brotherhood within, cannot but tend to deaden, in the countless minds which have grown up under its influence, that sense of the blessedness of Christian fellowship, that ardent desire for the Church's unity, that deep faith in the doctrine of the communion of saints, without which the Christian character is essentially incomplete."—*A few remarks upon Pews by J. W. Bowden, M.A.*

Another writer says, in the very same strain, corroborating the above by a striking anecdote, as follows:

"Fruitful have they been [Pews] as sources of many an evil thought, word, and work; of vanity to their possessors, of envy to those who coveted them, and of bitterness and litigation throughout a parish. Izaak Walton tells us, 'I knew one with a wife that nature had made peevish, and her husband's riches had made purse-proud, and must, because she was rich, and for no other virtue, sit in the highest pew in the Church, which being denied her, she engaged her husband into a contention for it, and at last into a law-suit with a dogged neighbour, who was as rich as he, and had a wife as peevish and purse-proud as the other, and this law-suit begot higher oppositions.' Often have they [Pews] precluded the humbler ranks from a due participation in the services of the Church, and as such, they have been instrumental in promoting schism and dissent, by driving individuals to meeting-houses, where the chief places can be more easily obtained."—*Markland's English Churches*, p. 39.

Let me add a passage from the "Ecclesiologist," vol. i, p. 101.

"In Eastwell Church, Kent, there has just been happily destroyed a pew so remarkable as to deserve to have its memory perpetuated. It was surmounted all round to the height of about two feet, with a stage of glass-work, provided with lattices to open and shut, according (we suppose) as the truths delivered might suit or displease ears polite."

Our correspondent happily calls it,

"Clausum latis specularibus antrum."—(*Juv.* iv, 20.)

It is true the pews in lately built churches do not approach the ridiculous character just described. But still in the churches of large towns *where are the poor?* Do not the pews confessedly keep them away, when the maintenance of the clergy is made to depend upon pew rents? How can the poor pay for pew rents? They are, therefore, necessarily excluded, because the few free seats that are intended for them, are seized by the strong and able-bodied, and by a class above the actual poor. Who ever sees the blind, the aged, the coarsely clad,—who ever hears the tottering and feeble step of the lame,—those to whom our Lord preached the gospel,—in a London church? None but the strong, the healthy, the vigorous, and the *well-dressed* dare to present themselves among the well-protected and pewed gentry of our London churches.

cutting off the chancel, as the most holy place, from the body of church. We have also the holy altar, towards which you ascend by steps, set apart; and the clergy with their *sedilia* for the time of holy communion. Here to the communicants the bread of life is distributed, and the most holy of our mysteries, the eucharistic sacrifice, offered up to God. Pews have, indeed, sometimes thrust themselves into the very chancel; but generally speaking, and at any rate at the altar-rails, distinction of persons is even with us forgotten. The rich and poor do equally kneel to receive the body and blood of their Redeemer. Praise be to God that at the altar, at any rate, we are nearer that impartiality and disrespect of persons which the Apostle so strongly advocates. The only thing which here in regret I would remark, in comparing our modern churches with the ancient, is this: the fewness, the extraordinary fewness of those who, professing to be members of Christ, and inheritors of His kingdom, make use of the privilege thus vouchsafed to them. How many are there, both of the rich and well educated, as well as the poor and unlearned, who throng the nave, and fill it with a slumbering and careless service, but never enter within the precincts of the chancel. Not like the penitents of old, who were debarred from the holy place in the discipline of penance and affliction for sin,—*anxious* to draw near, but not *permitted* until their time of discipline should be over, —not like these, except it be in some from an accusing conscience upbraiding them for leading a life in some point or other unholy. But in general, not like these, but from mere apathy and carelessness—from mere worldliness of life,—the congregations of our *naves* flee from the *chancel*, as from a sealed and dangerous place. There is every possible invitation, there is every possible opportunity; yet no further than the nave do hundreds come,—the glad ascending steps of the altar they never tread.

Such then has been the history of building churches,—such their meaning, such their use; but simple as the object is, and faithful as was the spirit of our forefathers in this land, in raising mighty structures for the worship of God,

—still it is surprising what cavils and objections have been made from time to time against them. The Puritans, men of those evil times when the throne and the Church were alike cast to the ground,—could not endure among other things belonging to our holy faith, the notion of the sacredness of a place. Pretending to think that all worship consisted in the spirit of the inner man, they could not attribute, in spite of God's word to David and Solomon, any particular value to a church as holy. First, they objected to the shape and division of our churches, saying that to divide the laity from the clergy was mere Judaism, and a mere assumption of priestly pre-eminence, not to be tolerated in the freedom of the Gospel. Then they objected to the dedication of our churches to angels, saints and martyrs; saying that, if at all dedicated, they should be dedicated to God alone. Next they objected to the sumptuousness and grandeur of our churches, saying that the early Christians worshipped in upper rooms, and that therefore plainness and simplicity were most consonant with Christian worship. And so, on all these pretexts they cried out, "Down with them, down with them, even to the ground". Imitating, as they said, Asa, Jehosaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, they destroyed or mutilated all our holy places, as though they had been heathen temples; and being exceedingly mad against them, desecrated them in every way that their misguided spirits could dictate. Let any one read the exploits of Cromwell and his army, in the history of the civil wars of that period. It was his delight to turn the churches into barracks for his soldiers, and stables for his horses. Nay more, to such a pitch of violence did they proceed, that the times of this rebellion may almost be compared to the blasphemous iniquities at which we shudder in the French Revolution; for we read in one account of those times, that, to ridicule the idea of baptism, they would baptize horses at the fonts; and the common jest of the day was, "the Reformation was now indeed a thorough one, since horses come to church".* Surely these profanations could not arise from hearts sin-

* Milner's History of Winchester, vol. i, p. 412.

cerely dedicated to Christ. We may make many allowances for zeal, for party spirit, for the erroneous impressions derived from the many abuses confessed to exist in our Church before the Reformation; but when the wrath of man was thus lit up into a flame which burned down all within its reach with indiscriminate destruction, we cannot say that true religion could have been its source.

And to what do these objections amount? As to the dedication of churches to angels and saints,—no practice is more ancient: not that it is to be considered in the light of *adoration* of such angels or saints, or of making them patrons and defenders, in superstitious trust in their merits; but simply this, that in such dedication we honour God, as in angels showing forth the glory of His power, and in saints and martyrs, the operations of His grace working in them holiness, as our fellow-creatures worthy to be had in memory. "The nations", saith S. Augustin, "to their gods erected temples; but we do not erect temples to our martyrs as to God, but we hold them as memorials unto dead men, whose spirits with God are still living."*

Again,—how can it be said that the division of our churches is anti-Christian? Is it not well to do as the ancient Christians did,—that the clergy should be recognized as a distinct order from the laity,—the one to minister, as stewards of the mysteries of God,—the other to be ministered unto? Hath not God Himself caused "divers orders in His Church"? And is it not well that such, God's will, should be marked — thus beholding in our chancels and choirs the priests and ministers of the sanctuary, while in the nave the laity have their suitable place? When the most holy place is marked off by rails, and kept sacred from common use, as holding the altar of God, it does nothing surely but add, in a right mind, to the solemnity of worship there to be performed. In an unthinking mind, fearfulness and awe may be generated without, of necessity, superstition; while in a reflecting spirit the soul may be taken up to God, in the habitual contemplation of His blessings and His graces there to be communicated.

* Augustin, De Civitate Dei, lib. xvii, c. 27, apud Hooker.

Again,—as to the sumptuousness of our churches. Hooker, in his strong way, justly and beautifully remarks: "Touching God Himself, hath He anywhere revealed that it His delight to dwell beggarly? And that He taketh no pleasure to be worshipped, saving only in poor cottages? Even then was the Lord as acceptably honoured of His people as ever, when the stateliest places and things in the whole world were sought out to adorn His temple."* It is quite true, indeed, that four bare walls may contain within them such holy and spiritual worshippers as shall be far more acceptable to God than the formal worshippers who assemble in the most sumptuous cathedral. It is quite true also that the Apostles did meet in a mere upper room, as already observed; but neither of these admissions involves the necessity of the conclusion that magnificence in church-building is wrong in Christianity. Our Lord Himself gives us a rule in all religious matters: "Neither do men put new wine into old bottles, else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish; but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved." Which simply means, that our rule of action should be consistency. In the poverty and persecution of the church of the Apostles in Jerusalem, the upper room was consistent; but in the wealth and security of our present Church, the upper room would be a manifest insult to the majesty of God. Should our nobility and gentry dwell in ceiled houses, with every appurtenance of grandeur, and yet be content to worship God within bare and naked walls? This cannot be consistent. Such a proceeding would argue anything but our faithfulness to Him from whom all we have descends, in this wealthy country, in such plentiful abundance.

Let us then put aside all such arguments, as of no value, —worse than of no value, as proceeding from an irreverent or a covetous disposition. Let us put them aside, as the mere ebullitions of a party zeal, without knowledge or genuine Christian spirit; and so suffer me to exhort you to reverence God's house, according to the Scriptures, as

* Hooker, Eccl. Pol. book v, § 15.

the "place where His honour dwelleth". Let me exhort you to make the aspect of a church, a symbolical representation of your faith and life; and so to work out of it a perpetual lesson of holiness, and a source of spiritual nourishment. A church is a type, a great spiritual type, of our religion in Christ Jesus. It must not be looked upon as a fabric of mere walls and timbers, but should be sanctified to us, as preaching some doctrine of our Lord in every part.* In the Apostolic Constitutions, this idea is

* The symbolizing of the different parts of a church with different parts and duties of religion is very common among the ancients. The following is found in Durant:—

"The disposition of the material church is after the fashion of a human body; for the chancel, or place where the altar is, represents the head, the cross on either side the arms and hands, and the remainder towards the west the rest of the body.

"The church consists of four walls. Being lengthened and widened by the doctrine of the four Evangelists, it rises on high: that is, to the heights of virtue. Its length, long suffering: its width, charity; its height, the hope of future retribution.

"Again in the Temple of God. The foundation is faith, which is 'of things not seen'; the roof charity, which 'covereth a multitude of sins'; the door obedience, of which our Lord says, 'If thou wilt *enter* into life, keep the commandments'; the pavement humility, of which the Psalmist says, 'My soul hath cleaved to the pavement'; the four lateral walls are the four principal virtues, justice, fortitude, prudence and temperance; the windows are bountiful hospitality, with gladness and mercy.

"Some churches are built after the manner of the cross, to denote that we should be crucified to the world; some in a round form, which signifies that the church is spread throughout the circle of the world.

"The porch signifies Christ, through whom we have entrance to the heavenly Jerusalem; the towers are the preachers and prelates of the church; the cock placed above the church designates the preachers, for the wakeful cock divides the hours of the deep night, rouses the sleepers, and proclaims the approach of day; the spire, above which is the cross, signifies by its roundness how perfectly and entirely the Catholic faith must be held; the glass windows are the holy Scriptures, which repel the wind and rain, and keep off hurtful things; the gate of the Church is Christ, whence in the Gospel, 'I am the gate, saith the Lord.'"

And so he goes on descending into the most minute points of the building of a church. Some indeed of the figures are very fanciful; but all are curious, and suggest many thoughts of good to those who would acquire the habit of feeding the mind with holy things when present in the house of God.—*Durandus, Rationale*, book 1, chapter i.

beautifully developed under the image of a ship. The *nave*, which is the name of one of our divisions of a church, means simply a *ship*, and so it falls in very suitably with this type. Thus it is said: "When thou callest an assembly of the church (as one that is in the command of a *great ship*), appoint the assemblies to be made with all possible skill, charging the deacons, as mariners, to prepare places for the brethren, as for passengers, with all due care and decency. And first let the building be long, with its head to the east, with its vestries on both sides to the east end, and so it will be like a ship. In the middle, let the bishop's throne be placed, and on each side of him let the deacons stand near at hand, in close and small girt garments, for they are like the mariners, and manage the ship."

You must picture yourself to the mind as an outcast upon the wide and troubled sea of the world,—the stormy waves of sin well nigh overwhelming you,—instant destruction impending,—no help near at hand. Then you behold the SHIP. You enter at the great west gate. You see the FONT there standing ready to receive you, and by baptism in faith to make you regenerate. Then, by baptism purified, you go onwards, and behold the *pulpit*, from whence your instruction in righteousness and in the doctrines of the Gospel shall with God's blessing be derived. Then you look still further, and behold the *chancel* and the holy ALTAR. To that altar, going up through the nave and chancel, you approach by steps ascending,—rightly *ascending*, for it is by that path you are approaching nearer to GOD and *heaven*, communicating with him in His body and blood, "He being in you, and you in Him". All this while, however, the waves of the world do not cease to buffet against the ship,—you are not entirely free from danger,—you are not absolutely safe,—you are only safe by faith and hope, and have great promises as long as you "*abide in the ship*", as S. Paul said to his shipwrecked mariners. But you must "abide in the ship",—that is, you must abide by the things you promise and learn there, and the privileges you gain there, and the protection and guardianship which are promised you there.

So, therefore, let us sail onwards in our voyage, careful, wary, full of faith. God is with us, if we use all things rightly, and as He would have us. Holy angels are with us, joining in our worship, and carrying up, as in Jacob's ladder, our prayers unto God. The Holy Scriptures are our chart, pointing out the track of our voyage, and guarding us against rocks and quicksands. The priests and ministers of God are our guides and pilots; the sacraments, our nourishment and support. Thus all things favour us. Only let us be of good cheer, and we shall safely come, sooner or later, through Christ Jesus, to the "land of everlasting life."

SERMON X.

THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

HEBREWS v, 4.

"*No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of* GOD, *as was Aaron.*"

THE course of the four preceding Lectures has been this: From the Preface headed "*Of* CEREMONIES, *why some be abolished and some retained*", we spoke of the ceremonial rites and customs of the Church. From the *Calendars and Tables* we spoke of the Church's holy times, first in her festival days, and secondly in her fasts; and from the rubric headed "*The Order for Morning and Evening Prayer*", in which mention is made of "the *Church*, *Chapel*, or *Chancel*," we spoke of the doctrine of holy places. But there is still another principle wanting, before we can complete the whole system of religious service. If ceremonial observances are right, and certain things are to be done and said in an appointed order, it is evident that certain men must be set apart for the preservation of that appointed order; if there are prayers to be offered, there must be some set apart to offer them; if there are mysteries of God, there must be some to take the stewardship of those mysteries; if there are holy fasts and festivals, there must be some to proclaim them, and to dictate their due keeping; if there are places set apart for God's worship, there must be some to consecrate and guard them, and be rulers in them. Hence the fourth consideration, involved in all the others; namely, *holy men*,—MINISTERS OF RELIGION,—men whose office it shall be to guide

and preside over all that is done and said in religion, to teach its principles, to enforce its laws, and to offer its services. All through the prefaces and rubrics which have been under consideration, this notion prevails. We have read of the "*clergy*" and "*ministers in the congregation*". Mention has been made of "*bishops and archbishops*", and of the "*ordinary*". It is directed, in one of the passages of the preface, that the Prayer Book shall be used daily throughout the year by "*the priests and deacons*". It is commanded that prayers shall be said "*by the curate*", and he is described as "*ministering* in every parish church or chapel." And even if the Prayer Book were silent,—if we had only been taught the doctrine of holy *ceremonies* and holy *places*,—still reason itself would, out of these doctrines, being granted, force us to the conclusion of the remaining doctrine, *holy men*. "Jacob worshipped upon a stone. The ark rested in Obed-Edom's house, and was holy in Dagon's temple ; and hills and groves, fields and orchards, according to the several customs of nations, were places of address ; but a *common person ministering* was so near a circumstance, and was so mingled with the action, that since the material part and exterior actions of religion could be acted and personated by *any man*, there was scarce anything left to make it religious, but the attrectation of the rites by a holy person. A holy place is something,—a separate time is something,—a prescript form of words is more,—and separate and solemn actions are more yet; but all these are *made common by a common person*, and therefore, without a distinction of persons, have not a natural and reasonable distinction of solemnity and exterior religion."*

Hence, therefore, you will observe our duty in the present lecture will fall in most appropriately with what has preceded,—namely, to investigate the appointment, the duties, and the privileges of holy men or ministers of God,—the CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

In the first place, in regard to the labours of men

* Bp. Jeremy Taylor, vol. xiv, p. 521, Bp. Heber's edition.

generally, serving God and one another in things political, it is a principle agreed upon, that, for the sake and welfare of the whole, there should be a division of labour among the parts. Every thing is better done, and with a better result, if, instead of all attending to every thing, we each attend to some particular branch of science, or of knowledge, or of business. For the same reason it is wiser, in the offices of *religion*, that a few should be selected out of many, to give themselves more exclusively to the study of divine things as a profession, than that all should be left indiscriminately or accidentally to serve in the offices of the Church. Just as it is wiser for a few to be *physicians* than all, or a few to be *lawyers* than all, or a few to be *merchants* than all; in order that each may, with more time and study, serve in his proper place, and so the better.

Such then may be considered, in point of *reason*, in point of *worldly wisdom*, the necessity of an order of men to minister in the things of God. But we must go on. This is only the beginning. In many secular trades or professions, a man has nothing more to do than to express his own will to pursue one of them. He, by study, renders himself *capable* of performing its duties, and then he begins to practise it. But in the office of a minister of God, he has, (*of course*) first to study it, and to have a *will* towards it; but he has more to do than, having the will and the preparation, then to assume it. He must receive an *appointment;* he must be *commissioned.* He cannot constitute himself a minister of God; however diligent, earnest, and clever he may be, he cannot say: "Of my own pleasure I will become a steward of the mysteries of Christ." No; he must be *called* to his profession. In other words, he must be ordained, as it is said in the epistle to the Hebrews: "No man taketh this office unto himself, but he that *is called.*"

And still again. In some professions, there may be some sort of appointment or commission necessary for their practice. There are credentials given, as to an ambassador; or seals given, as to an officer of state; or commissions given, as to the soldier. But all this is only of

men. It is of some body corporate, or of the state, or of the sovereign. But none of these will be sufficient for the minister of God. It is neither the state, nor the sovereign, nor any earthly tribunal or court whatsoever, that can give *him* his commission. There is only one source from which his authority can be derived. It is that of *God Himself*, even as it is said in the same text from the epistle to the Hebrews: "No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called OF GOD."

But yet again. There are persons in the world, who, taking up a notion of being "*called of God*," and interpreting some enthusiasm of mind which is peculiar to themselves to be a "call of God,"—as it is said, "*the inward call*",—have gone forth into the streets and villages, assuming the office of preacher and steward of the mysteries of Christ, merely from this internal persuasion. Now this would not be tolerated in any other profession of men. We should not be apt to trust him as a surgeon, who could only represent to us that he had an internal persuasion that he could perform the office of a surgeon. We should desire some external sign of his persuasion being real. We should desire external witnesses and testimony of his fitness, and not be content to rest on the presumption of his own will. So in the minister of God, and steward of the mysteries of Christ. It is true, that it is essential,—that it is vital to his due efficiency, that he should *be called of God.* He must have the assistance and co-operation of God's Holy Spirit. But he must have an *outward* appointment as well as an inward,—a testimony known to *man*, as well as a testimony known to himself. It will not do, that he *says* he has a call from God, he must be *known* to have it. And this is *ordination.* As saith the same text again, "No man taketh this honour unto himself but he that was called of God, *as was Aaron.*"

But still once more. An ambassador may come to a foreign court with false credentials. A soldier may serve in an army with a commission given from some one who had no *power* to give it. The *appearance* of an appointment may have taken place; but by reason of the *power*

of appointment being deficient, there may be no real appointment after all. And so is it possible in a man who calls himself a *minister of God*. There are some who make congregations to themselves, and then assume the ministerial power in those congregations; and there are some who arrogate to themselves, as once ministers of God, power to constitute others, as there are some who say this power is vested in kings and royal persons. But the sole authority is in those to whom *God* has given it in Scripture, not according to each person's own way of thinking. And so that same text will be apposite again:—"No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that was called of God, *as was Aaron*". *How* was Aaron called? By Moses. And who gave Moses the authority to call him? Even God Himself, for thus it is said, "Thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments, and anoint him, and sanctify him, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office".

So that we have these five essential principles to observe in considering the minister of God:

I. It must be his sole profession.

II. It must be his profession *by the appointment of others*.

III. It must be his profession in obedience to *a call of God*.

IV. It must be his profession by *a call of God*, in *God's own way;* that is, by external ordination.

V. It must be his profession by such external ordination, performed or celebrated by those *who have the power given them from God* for that purpose.

Now, shall we find all this in holy Scripture? We shall, most fully; both in the law and in the Gospel; both by facts and by precepts.

The first notion that we have of a priesthood is from the natural order of families, which may be called the *patriarchal* priesthood. Such we find to have been exercised by individuals not set apart by consecration, but only as deriving their authority from their personal position as heads of families,—fathers, princes, or kings. And thus we know, even among heathens, as deriving their custom from the Jewish people, the royal and the priestly power

were joined continually together ; and in Scripture we find Abel, Abraham, Job, Abimelech, Laban, Isaac, Jacob, and others, offering their own sacrifices to God : not seeking any appointed or separated order of men to do it in their behalf, but being priests themselves.*

After this patriarchal priesthood we come to the *legal;* but even here, the consecration or setting apart is by no means complete, at first. No doubt, as families multiplied, and the face of the earth was replenished with people, it became no longer necessary for every head of a family to offer sacrifice, but it would be more reasonable that some should be selected out of others. And so God appointed the first-born of every family to represent the rest. Thus we find it in Exodus xiii, 2, as a sort of memorial of the destruction of the first-born of Egypt, "Sanctify unto me all the first-born whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of men and beast : it is mine". And in Exodus xxii. 29, "The first-born of thy sons thou shalt give unto me." Afterwards, however, this sanctification of the first-born was done away. It would seem as though there was not sufficient separation or consecration in merely selecting one of a family as holy to God ; and so the law was made of selecting one

* In the list of the ancient patriarchs who fulfilled the office of a priest, the name of *Melchisedec* has been omitted. But Melchisedec's priesthood, as being entirely distinct from every other priesthood, and as typical of the priesthood of Christ, will be noticed further on in this lecture. He is not indeed to be considered as one of the patriarchs, being without a generation, not, as it appears, descended from any family of which we read in Scripture, and so, typical of the everlasting priesthood of Christ, and after Him His Apostles, without beginning and without end. It is remarkable in Melchisedec that his kingly office is closely joined with his priestly office, the interpretation of his name being "king of peace", so closely agreeing with *our king.* It is remarkable also, that when he went out to meet Abraham, he did not make any sacrifice of blood, but he presented him with *bread and wine,* or rather, offered him bread and wine in sacrifice to God, so closely agreeing with the eucharistic sacrifice of Him who was the antitype of Melchisedec. A great many of the Fathers notice this: Clemens Alexand. Strom. lib. iv. Cyprian, lib. ii, ep. 3 ad Cæcil. And Ambrose, lib. v, Sacram. chap. i. The comparison between Melchisedec and Christ is fully set forth in S. Paul to the Hebrews, cap. vii.

whole tribe, and appointing them *all*, as a body, to serve in religious offices. But still the original appointment was kept in force; and the first-born were redeemed by a specified sum paid into the Lord's treasury. Thus it is said in Numbers xviii, 15, "Nevertheless, the first-born of man shalt thou surely redeem." The tribe selected to take the place of the redeemed first-born was that of Levi, "And thou shalt take the Levites for me (I am the Lord) *instead* of all the first-born among the children of Israel." —Numb. iii, 41. "I have taken the Levites for all the first-born of the children of Israel, and I have given the Levites as a gift to Aaron and to his sons among the children of Israel, to do the service of the children of Israel in the tabernacle of the congregation."—Numb. viii, 18. Thus it was then. The whole tribe of Levi was set apart for the sacred office of ministering and sacrificing. There was no promise of inheritance given to them as to the other tribes, in the land of Canaan. They were to have no possession of their own, but were to be maintained as a distinct order by the tithes, first-fruits, and offerings of the whole of the children of Israel; all which may be seen in different portions of the book Leviticus.

Levi had three sons, Gershom, Kohath, and Merari. Out of these three families, God chose that of Kohath: and of the family of Kohath He chose Aaron. Aaron and his descendants were set apart out of the rest of the tribe of Levi to be *priests;* while again as that family should branch out in course of time into many subdivisions, the lineal descendants of Aaron should exercise the office of high-priest, whose privileges were peculiar as above all other priests, entering the holy of holies once a year, with the sacrifice of atonement. And while this one family were thus made priests for the duty of Sacrifice, all the rest of the tribe, as inferior ministers, were to serve in the tabernacle or temple, waiting upon Aaron. And so even the children of Moses himself were only Levites, while Aaron and his sons were raised above all others by the solemn consecration of God. This consecration is detailed at great length in holy Scripture in the eighth chapter of Leviticus; but it is summed up concisely in the fortieth chapter of

Exodus, "Thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and wash them with water: and thou shalt put upon Aaron the holy garments, and anoint him, and sanctify him, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office: and thou shalt bring his sons, and clothe them with coats, and thou shalt anoint them, as thou didst anoint their father, that they may minister unto me in the priest's office, for their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations." While this consecration affected the priesthood as distinct, so in a similar way, though with less ceremonial, the Levites also were set apart and consecrated.—Numb. viii, 5. "And the Lord spake to Moses, saying, take the Levites from among the children of Israel, and cleanse them: and thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them, sprinkle water of purifying upon them, and let them shave all their flesh, and let them wash their clothes, and so make themselves clean.....And Aaron shall offer the Levites before the Lord for an offering of the children of Israel, that they may execute the service of the Lord.*

Here, then, we have the full development of the system of holy men, by God's ordinance set apart as His ministers. We have the selection, the consecration, the degrees of rank in service, the service to be done, the maintenance,

* It is true that we do hear sometimes of persons not of Aaron's family offering sacrifices to the Lord; as, for instance (1 Sam. vii, 9) Samuel offered a lamb. Saul also offered a burnt offering (1 Sam. xiii, 9). Elijah sacrificed on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xviii, 33). Also David (2 Sam. vi, 14; and 2 Sam. xxiv, 25). And Solomon at Gibeon (2 Chron. i, 6). And more especially we read of David consulting the Lord, clothed in the ephod, which was the priestly dress; and Solomon the same (1 Sam. xxiii. 9, &c). By this it would appear that the office of a judge, or prophet, or a king, was in some degree connected with the priesthood; and the setting apart of the one office as ruler of the people, did confer some grace, as being distinct from all others, and bringing such persons nearer to God. The ceremony of *anointing* which appertained to those offices would seem to show this; anointing being the particular sacramental means of conferring the grace of God. In this light, our sovereigns to this day are anointed upon their coronation, and so become the consecrated servants of God.

and the order of the men. Nothing can be plainer, more minute, more strongly convincing of the will of God, in the arrangement of His service.

And remarkable indeed it is how singularly adapted such a system is, for the maintenance of religion through the advance of ages. One portion of twelve were to be holy men. If the appointment had been of individuals, the same proportion of a twelfth would not long have held. But as it was, the tribe of Levi would of course increase in relative proportion with the other eleven tribes; and with the population increasing, would the ministers of God be also increasing. And the same may be observed in regard to the *maintenance* of the priesthood. If only a certain sum had been set apart, that which would have sufficed for a few at the commencement, would have become insufficient for the increasing number in course of time; but the maintenance depending on a proportion of the increase of property, and not only that, but on a proportion of the increase of the fruits of the earth, it would follow that as the numbers of the people would increase, so the first-fruits, and the tithes, and all the other oblations would increase, securing for ever a proportionate maintenance for the ministers of the sanctuary. All these, indeed, are patterns for the regulation of divine things, which it would be well for us of the present day a little more closely to imitate than we do.

But let us proceed. We have now seen the system upon which the holy men of Israel were directed in their separation and consecration to God. The question next for us will be, was this system, so ordained of God, carried into effect in the Jewish polity? Do we find any instances in which a *human* system of appointing teachers and priests of religion, apart from this divine law, was attempted? Could any one, or did any one of the ordinary tribes of the Jewish people, assume to himself the office of a Levite, or could a Levite of the ordinary class assume to himself the office of a priest? These questions are very easily answered. The preservation of this law was indeed most minutely and rigidly observed. We have but to turn over the pages of our Bible to behold abundant in-

stances of the jealous watchfulness by which this system of consecrated men was kept, and the signal punishments which descended on those who violated it. The first instance of opposition to the ordinance of God in his priesthood is very well known as that of Koran, Dathan, and Abiram. In the sixteenth chapter of Numbers, we have a detailed account of this proceeding. Korah himself was a Levite; but Dathan and Abiram were children of Reuben. This Levite, together with fifty princes of the people, "famous in the congregation, men of renown", rose up against Moses and Aaron, and rebelled against the ordinance of God in the priesthood, which had been established. They said: "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them. Wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" Nothing could be plainer. Nothing could more decidedly bring the point to a fair issue. A Levite, and a company of lay-men of the first rank, cannot submit to be ruled over in things divine by one whom God has appointed. His pre-eminence and sanctification as God's priest cannot be tolerated. Equality is demanded, and equal rights claimed for every one, without distinction or separation, on the ground that each is equally fit to minister before the Lord. But how was this claim met? By the command of God, Moses addresses the Levite, and reminds him of his proper place and order. He bids him, together with his rebellious company, to bring censers and exercise the holy office, upon trial; he bids them try what they can do as priests: and take the effect, as by God's direction, to test the propriety of their complaint. They do so; and the result is dreadfully significant of the will of the Almighty. In the presence of the assembled people, "The ground clave asunder that was under them. The earth opened her mouth and swallowed them up, and their houses, and all the men that appertained unto Korah, and all their goods.....The earth closed upon them, and they perished from among the congregation." Another instance we have of an unauthorized assumption of the priesthood in the remarkable story of Micah, in the book of Judges.

The account is brought forward as an illustration of times when disorder and anarchy were confessedly rife,—when there was no ruler or governor,—and when, as it is said, "every man did that which was right in his own eyes". Micah, falling away from the true worship, sets up teraphim, that is, images,—idolatrous images for worship,—and he assumes the ephod (the priestly dress). He appears to be a man zealous in religion; but by reason of living in times of political and religious confusion, to have lost sight of its real principles. Leaving the law, he makes, as it were, a sort of private establishment of his own,—a sort of domestic religion,—for along with the images and ephod (so soon does one error fall into another), he is induced to make one of his own sons act the part of priest. Still he is not satisfied. Setting up this unauthorized worship, and this unauthorized priest, he feels that there is something deficient. He would fain achieve something more like the real service which he had lost, and so, meeting accidentally with a Levite who came that way, he offered him wages to live with him as his priest. He consented, "and Micah consecrated the Levite, and the young man became his priest." Observe what a maze of confusion is here. False worship, false gods, a false priest, and yet all the semblance of a consecration and a zealous worship. But what was the result? Did God permit this to endure? The children of Dan, coming that way, destroy the images and dismiss the priest, and all ends in confusion. "They took the things which Micah had made, and the priest which he had, and coming to Laish, they smote it with the edge of the sword, and burnt the city with fire." But again, in a degree which *we* might think much more trifling; in matters much more minute, we find interference with the duty of the appointed order of holy men punished by the hand of God. David was bringing up the ark from Kirjath-Jearim. It was a law that no one should touch the ark but holy men; but Uzzah put forth his hand and took hold of it. For this apparently trivial error (though in God's estimation it was not trivial), the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah, and God smote him, and he died by the ark of the

Lord (2 Sam. vi). Again, Saul, though a king, and invested with many prerogatives, yet not being a priest, was, for intermeddling with divine things, deprived of his kingdom (1 Sam. xiii). Uzziah, another king, attempted to burn incense before the Lord upon the holy altar, which was the office of the priest. For this sin (2 Chron. xxvi, 19), he was smitten with leprosy. But of all the instances of intrusion on the priest's office, that of Jeroboam is the greatest, and the most signal for the fearful consequences which ensued. He tore asunder the united kingdom of Solomon and David. He set up strange altars at Dan and Bethel, and erected what are called in Scripture "high places". In this strange worship he wanted priests and Levites. And what did he? Fully aware that no worship could long exist without the ministerial order, and the priests and Levites remaining faithful at Jerusalem, "*he made priests of the lowest of the people who were not of the sons of Levi.*" He made *himself* also a sort of high-priest, and offered incense upon the altar. But a man of God came down, and cried out against the altar, rebuking the wicked king. The king put out his hand against the man of God, but the hand so put forth "was dried up, so that he could not draw it in again". And then it is said,—though at the intercession of the man of God the king's hand had been restored,—it is said, "After this thing, Jeroboam returned not from his evil way, but made *again* of the lowest of the people, priests of the high places. *Whosoever would*, he consecrated him, and he became one of the priests of the high places. *And this thing became sin unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off, and to destroy it from off the face of the earth*" (1 Kings xiii). And we have nothing to do, but, according to this denunciation, to trace onwards the history of that ill-fated kingdom, of the ten tribes thus founded in rebellion and in schism, when we shall soon see how surely and how utterly God's wrath visited them for the sin of Jeroboam. They have been scattered to the winds, and are no longer a people. They forsook God's order in holy men, and God forsook them.

But it is time that we consider how this notion of a

priesthood was to endure under the dispensation of the Gospel, for as yet we have only spoken of the law. Previous to the Levitical or legal priesthood, there had been an order of a far higher and more enlarged character, in Melchisedec. This Melchisedec, king of Salem, received tithes from Abraham, and blessed Abraham. (See Hebrews vii.) And inasmuch as the less is blessed of the greater, so Abraham, and in him his descendants, manifested by this typical representation, the superiority of Melchisedec's order of priesthood. It was a priesthood without descent; but Levi's was with descent. It was a priesthood over all the world; but Levi's was only over the children of Israel. It was a priesthood without beginning or end; but Levi's had both, for beginning in Aaron, it ended with the advent of Messias. When Messias came, Melchisedec's priesthood was fulfilled: he became, as S. Paul says, "a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec." But now our Lord, thus being a priest, and having thus a right to dispense with outward calls and manifestations, yet did *not* dispense with them; but for our sake submitted to them. He did not assume the ministerial office without an express and visible appointment. You will carefully observe, first, that he did not assume the office of public ministration until he was of the legal age; nor, secondly, until there was a special manifestation from on high that he was appointed by God, and anointed: "The spirit of God descended like a dove, and lighted upon him; and lo! a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." Then, immediately that He became a public teacher *Himself*, He appointed others also to help Him. Out of the whole number of his disciples, He chose seventy to go before Him and preach the kingdom of God. He sends them forth, as you will see (Luke x), with full and explicit authority, as in a chain through Him, from God the Father. How remarkable were His words, "He that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth Me, and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me." It seems to mark that there was the same authority between the seventy ministers whom he thus appointed, which there was between

Himself and God, and in fact the authority was the same; for He was the Son of God, and God. But not only the seventy, He chose more prominently still, the twelve. While the seventy were sent forward to preach the kingdom, the twelve were kept as domestic and continual hearers of His private conversations, to be witnesses of His miracles, to be present at His sufferings, His passion, and death; so that when He should depart out of the world, they might remain as the favoured and distinctly authorized heads and rulers of His Church. These twelve then He marked out by a distinct name,—"*Apostles*." To these twelve, He imparted, above all others, peculiar gifts. These He permitted alone to be present at His solemn institution of the Lord's Supper. These He commissioned, on the very last time He spoke upon earth, saying: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Nothing can be more clear, nothing can be more decisive, than that it was our Lord's will that His Church should be governed by a regularly-appointed ministry. These men whom He chose, He called away from their several trades and occupations. He separated them, laid hands upon them, and made them holy. To the fishermen he said, "Leave your nets, and become fishers of men." To the publicans he said, "Follow me," and they rose up, left all, and followed Him. The command of Christ was, "As ye go, preach, saying, the kingdom of heaven is at hand; heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils; freely ye have received, freely give."

Such then was the case during the life of our Lord upon earth. How was it after His departure? No otherwise. The first thing that is related in the Acts of the Apostles is the appointment of Matthias, to supply the place of the traitor Judas. When they were all assembled, Peter said, "Of the men who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among

us, must one be ordained." And then they prayed, and said: "Thou Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, shew, whether of these two thou hast chosen." Herein we recognize three great principles: some one to be set apart, —some one to be set apart by *God*,—and some one to be set apart by the *external ordinance of man*, under God; for it was the Apostles themselves who selected the two "*to be ordained*"; and then having so selected them, they referred them to God, that, of the two, one might be again selected by Him. There are three remarkable features in the apostleship of S. Matthias: first, that he did not appoint *himself* or place *himself* in the ranks of the teachers of God. Secondly, that he was elected by God and man *together*, and that expressly, openly, and in order;—neither did the eleven make the election without reference to God, nor did God make the election without reference to the Apostles; but there was just that junction of the divine and human ordinance which is traceable in the former priesthood of the Levitical law. And thirdly, it is remarkable, that in the case of S. Matthias, it was an election to fill up a vacant place,—it was an election of *succession*. One had failed, but the ordained number of twelve must be maintained: "His bishopric let another take." And here, again, it is parallel with the Levitical priesthood of succession; only in the former it was a literal succession from father to son, and here it is a spiritual succession of an everlasting priesthood, *after the order of Melchisedec*. This ordination, then, from its place, as being the first after the departure of our Lord,—as being made in the interval between the Ascension and the descent of the Holy Ghost,—as being thereby sealed and confirmed by the gift of tongues, a few days subsequently, with God's approval, is marked out most singularly and providentially as the form and pattern of the appointment, the consecration, and the succession of the Christian priesthood.*

* The name of "*priest*," given to the ministers of Christ's Church, has frequently been a stumbling-block in the eyes of those who are disaffected to the principles of the Church of England. The word "*priest*" is a contraction from the longer word "presbyter," in Greek

But let us advance still further. The gifts of the Holy Ghost having been imparted,—the Church making its onward way, and the number of disciples increasing,—we find very shortly the need arising of further ministerial help. To

πρεσβυτερος, which signifies an elder. The Hebrew word is כהן, cohen. Calmet says: "The Hebrew cohen, which signifies a 'priest,' is sometimes put for prince. In Exod. ii. 16, it is said that Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, was a priest, כהן, cohen, of Midian,—that is, according to some, prince or governor of the city. In 2 Sam. viii, 18, it is said that the sons of David were priests—cohenim—that is, princes, and considered in the country as priests. The septuagint say, they were, Αὐλάρχαι ἦσαν, principal courtiers,—chiefs of the court. The author of the first book of Chronicles (xviii, 17) explains this by saying they were the nearest at the king's hand,—they had the chief employment at court." But however this be,—whatever be the meaning of the word cohen,—it certainly comes very near in signification to the word "elder," meaning a person of dignity, according to the word πρεσβυτερος.

Such then will be the *verbal* definition of priest. But we must look much higher than this; for although πρεσβυτερος is one Greek word for priest, the other Greek word Ἱερευς, corresponding with the Latin "sacerdos," comes closer as the *real* definition: and it is in this sense, coupled with the former, that we must now look upon it,—that is, "a man occupied in things holy", "a man who offers sacrifice." It is to this sense of the word priest that persons object; but let us consider on what grounds they object.

Bishop Sparrow says: "The Greek and Latin words which we translate priest, are derived from words which signify holy [sacerdos, Ἱερεὺς]; and so the word priest, according to the etymology, signifies him whose mere charge and function is about holy things, and, therefore, seems to be a most proper word for him who is set apart to the holy public service and worship of God, especially when he is in the actual ministration of holy things. If it be objected that, according to the usual acceptation of the word, it signifies him who offers up a sacrifice, and therefore cannot be allowed to a minister of the Gospel, who hath no sacrifice to offer,—it is answered that the ministers of the Gospel *have sacrifices to offer*. 1 Pet. ii, 5: 'Ye are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifice of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving.' In respect of these, the ministers of the Gospel may be safely, in a metaphorical sense, called priests, and in a more eminent manner than other Christians are, because they are taken from among men to offer up these sacrifices for others. But besides these spiritual sacrifices mentioned, the ministers of the Gospel have another sacrifice to offer, viz. the unbloody sacrifice, as it was anciently called,—the commemorative sacrifice of the death of Christ; and in respect of this sacrifice of the eucharist, the ancients have usually called those that offer it up priests. And if Melchisedec were called a priest, as he is, often, by

supply this need, an order was established very similar in its office to that of the Levites in the Jewish law,—the order of *deacons*. The meaning of *deacon* is, a minister, one who attends upon others; and just as the Levite was to attend upon the priest, so the deacon seems to have been appointed to serve in the lower offices of religion, and assist the apostle or elder. But let us observe *how* this office was appointed. The deacons did not set up *themselves*. They did not say: "We see the need which the Church has of further help in the work of the ministry. *We* are fit persons to supply this need. We have zeal and ability, and an anxious desire to serve God; and so, without any further trouble or ordination, we will enter upon the work". They did not say this; but, on the

S. Paul to the Hebrews, who had yet no other offering or sacrifice that we read of but that of bread and wine (Gen. xiv, 18), why may not they whose office is to bless the people as Melchisedec did, and, besides that, to offer holy bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ, of which (Melchisedec's) at most was but a type, be as truly and without offence called 'priest' also?"—*Rationale of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 337.

Hooker, in the same way, says: "Howbeit because the most eminent part both of heathenish and Jewish service did consist in sacrifice, when learned men declare what the word 'priest' doth properly signify, according to the mind of the first imposer of that name, their ordinary schools do well expound it to imply sacrifice. Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? Surely even as S. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto the very substance of fishes, which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing. Whereupon, when philosophers will speak warily, they make a difference between flesh in one sort of living creatures, and that other substance in the rest which hath but a kind of analogy to flesh: the Apostle contrariwise having matter of greater importance whereof to speak, nameth indifferently both flesh. The fathers of the Church of Christ, with like security of speech, call usually the ministry of the Gospel 'priesthood,' in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices,—namely, the communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although it hath properly now no sacrifice. As for the people, when they hear the name, it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or of an alderman causeth them to think upon old age, or to imagine that every one so termed must needs be ancient, because years were respected in the first nomination of both."

contrary, the Apostles themselves, as rulers of the Church, originated and completed the whole affair. It was they who said to the laity of the Church: "Look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom, *whom we may appoint.* And when this was done, they laid their hands upon them." So that here is observable again the Church proceeding in her work according to her method. Not an individual choice,—not an accidental or temporary assumption of a duty,—but the choice of the Church in her rulers, and the ordination of the Church by her rulers. So again, a little further in the history, we find the remarkable case of S. Paul,—one called out of due time,—miraculously called,—one in whom we might beyond all others say that external ordination might be dispensed with. Yet what was the case? He would not undertake his office until set apart by the usual external appointment of the Church, by laying on of hands. He and S. Barnabas were commissioned by the Holy Ghost to go to the Gentiles. One would have thought this commission, inwardly given to such men, sufficient. But it was not sufficient. Thus it is said: "When they [the other Apostles] had fasted and prayed, and *laid their hands on them*, they sent them away." And then immediately after it is said: "So they being sent forth *by the Holy Ghost*, departed into Seleucia"—as though this external appointment by authorized men—*the Apostles*—was necessary to the fulness of their commission, and (being according to our Lord's command)—was under and with the sanction and authority of the *Holy Ghost.*

Thus, as far as our Lord's own life, and the state of the Church immediately succeeding, can testify, we have the order of the ministers of God as clearly set before us as it was in the Levitical priesthood. We have the *Apostles*,—with power of ordaining and appointing others,—the first order. We have *others* not Apostles, but taking a second place, with peculiar gifts, in the ministry of the word, such as the seventy, who may be called elders or priests. And then, as a completion of the whole system, we have the deacons taking their place as the inferior ministers in the

third order.* But we must still advance; for the time was to come when all who had been appointed by the Lord or the Lord's Apostles should die away: the eleven, —S. Matthias, S. Paul and S. Barnabas, special apostles,

* We must distinguish between the three orders of the ministry, and those many other offices of the Church which are mentioned by S. Paul, in some cases subsidiary, in others the same, but in different capacities. For instance, S. Paul says in Ephes. iv, 11: "He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." And in 1 Cor. xii, 28: "First apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues," &c. &c. These, and similar passages, refer to the spiritual gifts of the Church during the actual time of the Apostles; they do not necessarily involve the order or gradation of ministers, as afterwards developed in the Church, to continue as its permanent ministry.

We must also distinguish between the three *orders* of the Church and the many subsidiary *officers*, who hold places of duty, but not of the sacerdotal or ministerial character.—Thus Hooker discriminates between them:

"There is an error which beguileth many, who do much entangle both themselves and others by not distinguishing *services*, *offices*, and *orders* ecclesiastical. The first of which three, and in part the second, may be executed by the laity; whereas none have, or can have the third, but the clergy. Catechists, exorcists, readers, singers, and the rest of the like sort, if the nature only of their labours and pains be considered, may in that respect seem clergymen, even as the Fathers for that cause term them usually clerks; as also in regard of the end whereunto they were trained up, which was to be ordered when years and experience should make them able. Notwithstanding, inasmuch as they noway differed from others of the laity longer than during that work of service which at any time they might give over, being thereunto admitted nor tied by irrevocable ordination, we find them always exactly severed from that body whereof those three before rehearsed orders alone are natural parts."

The Church of Rome possesses four (as she terms them now) minor orders; namely, readers, acolytes, exorcists, and ostiarii. The Church of Greece reckons subdeacons, readers, singers, and ostiarii (door-keepers.) In some Churches, these minor officers were considered as mere laymen; in others, they were in a manner set apart with an inferior ordination. In our own Church, it is almost superfluous to add, though we have lay-clerks, choristers, sacristans, vergers, and the like, we do not consider them as under ordination, but officers of the Church for the time being. All the inferior orders in the Western Church used the surplice, as indeed our lay-clerks do at present in cathedral establishments and in many parish churches. The use of the surplice for those officers of the Church who actually take part in the service (choristers) is very much restored.

—the seventy,—the seven deacons,—all must pass away in time. The last of the Apostles, S. John, remaining till the close of the first century, saw them all depart. What then was to become of the Church? Not possessing a descent from father to son, or any special tribe or family, by which the apostleship might be preserved, as in Aaron's case,—was the priesthood to cease? To this we must reply, by our Lord's promise to the Apostles at his departure: "*Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.*" How could this apply? How could He be with them when they were gone, and neither He nor they any longer in the world, except in the sense of being with their *successors*,—with the Church by them transmitted from generation to generation? It is not meant that they were always to exist as individuals, but that they were always to exist as an *order*, as the Levites and the Aaronic priesthood did before, by *succession;* that He would be always with them, as the governors of his Church; and that such governors, appointed one by the other, should remain unto the end of the world. And such was the fact. Titus was appointed bishop of Crete. S. Paul, in his epistle to him, reminds him that he is so appointed not only for himself and his own teaching, but for the purpose of continuing other ministers of God after him: "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain elders in every city*, as I had appointed thee." And to Timothy he writes in the same way: "The things that thou hast heard of me, among many witnesses, the same commit thou to *faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.*" Now the Apostles died. But the bishops took their place, as the first order in the Church. At first, during the existence of the Apostles, they were elders or priests only; but afterwards those who were, like Timothy and Titus, endued with the power of ordaining, became separated from those who had not the power of ordaining. Out of the elders or priests certain were set over the Church, to guide, preside, and to ordain others; and they taking the name of bishops or overseers, became the first

order,—while the priests and deacons remained as before in the second and third order.

And thus it has continued up to the present hour. The Church has ever maintained these three orders of her ministry. She suffers no one to usurp these offices, or take upon *himself* the preaching of God's word, or the administration of the sacraments. She does not consider that to be a sufficient authority for the office of the priesthood, which is short of the internal calling of the Holy Spirit, together with the external calling of the Church manifested by the laying on of hands by such as have a commission thereunto. And our own Church, falling in and agreeing with the Church Catholic, has ever deemed episcopal ordination essential to the reality of the ministerial function, and consequently teaches that there cannot be any virtue in sacraments, any power of binding and loosing, or any authority in teaching, save in those who come from the Apostles, through the chain of episcopal laying on of hands. Thus the Church of England formally and openly holds in the Preface set before the Ordinal:

> It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by publick Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continued, and reverently used and esteemed, in the United Church of England and Ireland; no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the United Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration, or Ordination.

For upwards of eighteen hundred years, this has ever been the doctrine of Christ's people, and until three hundred years ago was never questioned. Presbyterian ordination, if such a term can be used, was never heard of until a sect of the continential reformers, forced out of communion with Rome, were compelled, as a matter of

necessity, to resort to it. Herein lies the misfortune of the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Kirk of Scotland, so called, and some others,—that an apostolical priesthood is not among them. Teachers they may have, and presidents over congregations they may have, but PRIESTS they have not. And herein lies the blessing of the Church of England, that when she purified herself from the errors which had overspread her, she lost not her bishops; but her bishops taking the lead in her reformation, and joining with the people, continued unbroken the line of the apostolical succession, and handed down to us of the present day, with a descent untainted, the privileges of the early Church, the power of the keys, the presence of Christ in her sacraments, and the promise of the Redeemer, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." It has come to us, indeed, through many persecutions and corruptions; through many vicissitudes and sorrows; but it *has* come to us,—blessed be God,—and our people may indeed be thankful in the thought, that the same Holy Spirit which presided over the ordination of S. Matthias, of S. Paul and S. Barnabas, of Titus and Timothy, of Ignatius and Polycarp, of Clement and Irenæus, presides now, we may hope, according to the promise of our Lord, over the ordinations of every bishop, priest, and deacon, in this land.*

* The question of the apostolical succession of our bishops in the English Church is a vital one. Bishop Pearson places a belief in the Holy Ghost as necessary for the continuation of a *successive ministry*; thereby inferring that the ministry of a Church, to be a true ministry, must come from the Holy Ghost Himself, imparted in succession by apostolic communication. "As the Son sent the Apostles, so did they send others, by virtue of the same Spirit, as S. Paul sent Timothy and Titus, and gave them power to send others, saying to Timothy, 'Lay hands suddenly on no man,' and to Titus, 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and *ordain elders* in every city, as *I had appointed thee.*' Thus, by virtue of an apostolical ordination, *there is for ever to be continued a ministerial succession.*"—*Pearson on the Creed*, Article 8.

Bishop Jeremy Taylor, speaking on the same subject, explains the difference between the miraculous calling of the first Apostles, and the now common and *ordinary* calling given to the clergy of the present day:

"The rising of the spring is of greater wonder, and of more extra-

It is, indeed, objected, that there are frequently among us, men who fall grievously away from their ordination vows; that many are defaulters, many "castaways".—

ordinary and latent reason, than the descent of the current; and the derivation of the powers of the Holy Ghost that made the priestly order, was just like the creation. The first man was made with God's own hands, and all the rest by God co-operating with a human act; and there is never the same necessity as at first for God to create man. The species or kind shall never fail, but be preserved in an ordinary way. And so it is in the designation of the ministers of the evangelical priesthood.—God breathed into the Apostles τὸ πανάγιον καὶ ζωοποιὸν πνεῦμα—'the breath of the life-giving spirit'; and that breath was to be continued in a perpetual, universal production; they who had received, they were also to give,—and they only could."—*Divine Institut. of Office Ministerial*, vol. xiv, p. 480, Heber.

But some people say: "This is all very well in *theory*. It is all very beautiful in *imagination*, that the clergy of the present day should be considered as descendants of the Apostles; but is there in *fact*, in *reality*, any ground for supposing that an actual succession has been maintained?" This is far too wide a field for lectures of so popular character as these to enter upon; but I will quote one passage from Mr. Palmer's Treatise on the Church: "All the great Churches preserved catalogues of their bishops from the time of the Apostles, as we may see in Eusebius. Rome traced her succession from Linus, Cletus, and Clement, who were appointed bishops by the Apostles. Jerusalem in like manner commenced her catalogue with James, the Lord's brother. Alexandria traced her origin to Mark the evangelist, who constituted Arianus his successor. Athens, as we have seen, was governed by Dionysius the Areopagite, in the time of the Apostles,—Smyrna, by Polycarp; Ephesus, by Onesimus, probably the friend of S. Paul."—Part vi, chap. i.

Irenæus says: "We can enumerate those who were appointed by the Apostles bishops in the Churches, and their successors even to us.....They wished those to be very perfect and blameless in all things, whom they left *as their successors*, delivering to them their own place of government": and then Irenæus gives us a *catalogue of the bishops* of the Roman Church.—*Contr. Hæres.* lib. iii, c. 3.

In the same way, Tertullian says: "Let them unfold the catalogue of their bishops so descending by succession from the beginning, that the first bishop had some one of the Apostles, or of apostolic men united with the Apostles, as his ordainer and predecessor."—*De Præscript.* c. 32.

Hence then we find that, as a matter of historical record,—as a *fact*, not as a theory,—the succession from the Apostles was not only ever held as a necessary note of the truth of a Church, but also we find catalogues of bishops existing, and to which appeal was made to verify that note.

But in regard to *our own Church*,—have *we* the apostolical succes-

Still that does not invalidate the truth of what has been said generally, that the Holy Spirit is with us. We must remember that even in our Lord's own twelve Apostles,—those of His own personal choosing—one of them was a devil. Now, if one was evil out of twelve of Christ's own, we must not be surprised, that some are evil among *us*. Leaving these blots and blemishes as *individual* cases, and looking to the general aspect of the Church,—looking to the promise of our Lord—we may indeed rejoice as a

sion? May it not be said that it is very true the early Churches might have preserved *their* succession, but it does not follow that the same is the case with *us*. It was on this ground that the Romanists attacked us in the matter of Archbishop Parker, in the reign of Elizabeth.—Knowing full well that all about our Church was good and sound, provided *this* point was good and sound, they attacked us in this fountain and spring of the note of a true Church, and invented what every one at present knows by the name of "*the Nag's Head Consecration.*" They pretended that Archbishop Parker was not lawfully and canonically consecrated. This fable has been refuted time after time; but in spite of its constant refutation, even to this day it is brought forward by Romanists to throw a slur or blemish on our orders. Let us consider it. Let us agree that the succession of our bishops is now derived from S. Augustin, as S. Augustin's is clearly derived from the Roman Church, from which he came; always, however, bearing in mind that there were English bishops in Wales prior to S. Augustin, and they would give us a succession in all probability from the East, independent of Rome. But let us take S. Augustin, as undoubtedly giving the greater portion of our Church their orders. Matthew Parker was seventieth in succession from S. Augustin. Now it happens that there is an authentic register of his consecration preserved in the proper courts of the see of Canterbury; and there is also another in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, which the archbishop left to that college. In these registers we find that the consecration took place on December 15, 1599, at Lambeth chapel; that four bishops joined in the consecration,—William Barlow, bishop of Bath and Wells; John Scorey, bishop of Chichester; Miles Coverdale, bishop of Exeter; and John Hodgskinne, suffragan bishop of Bedford. Now these four being allowed to have had proper consecration themselves from prelates of the Church preceding the Reformation, they had undoubtedly apostolical power to consecrate another bishop. The thing is then perfectly plain. Every priest and bishop now existing traces up his ordination to some previous bishop, who traces it up to Archbishop Parker. Archbishop Parker traces his consecration seventieth in order from S. Augustin; and S. Augustin again traces his upwards to the APOSTLES, through the bishops of the Church of Rome.

Church, in the possession of this great blessing and privilege, that we trace the appointment of our clergy to the very divine source of our Lord Himself. Why, then, do any separate from us? Why does the flock forsake the appointed shepherd? Why are there among us so many sects and schisms? Why do we see teachers arrogating to themselves offices which Christ has not authorized them to assume, and congregations pursuing their religion on a voluntary principle, like Micah, in tracks and bye-paths, which no Church of any time or country for fifteen hundred years ever heard of? How is it, in short, that there can be among us a single Christian without a bishop and a priest? God forbid that I should speak in breach of charity against any man. There are many teachers of the Independents, Wesleyans, and others, who, though *they may* be in *schism*, may be innocent of any purposed and intentional sin, and no doubt are. But the question for them is, and the question through them for the people who follow them is: whence have they derived their appointment? How stand they up to preach and administer God's mysteries? How can they say they come from God? *Internally* (as they assert) they are called of God. So was S. Paul; but yet, he was externally *ordained*. But they *are* ordained (as they assert) by their own fellow-ministers. But who gave these fellow ministers that authority? This is the turning point of the question. This it is which unhinges all their acts, renders weak and doubtful their highest services,—throws an uncertainty, at least, over their *baptisms*, over their *marriages*, over their sacraments of the Lord's Supper,—over all, in fact, that is done among them. Put aside *doctrine*,—put aside the natural *seemliness* of a succession from bishop to bishop,—put aside the ability and learning of *preachers*,—put aside all, but this one fact: THE DOUBT OF THEIR COMMISSION, and then have we not, my brethren, great reason to praise God, that in us, all is clear; that whatever may be *their* case, still WE have this certain comfort, that our holy orders of bishops, priests and deacons, can show their authority, and prove their holy commission even from the time of the Apostles and our Lord Himself?

And now, my brethren, some few words of warning will terminate what is to be said on this subject; words of warning, first to you, the laity, and then to ourselves, the clergy.

And first, to *you:* admitted by God's grace into the very peculiar privileges of Christ's holy Catholic Church in England, which is free, on the one hand, from the corruptions of Rome, and, on the other, from the deficiencies, not to say the sins, of schism or dissent,—to you, possessing in this Church the peculiar blessing of a clergy in the full orthodox doctrine of the faith, and pure in descent from the highest sources of antiquity; and yet, withal, not losing one jot or one tittle of the full freedom of Christ's Gospel,—to you this clergy must surely present a claim to your *attention*, not to say your obedience. We must not unduly magnify our office. And yet it is better to magnify our *office* than *ourselves*. There is danger in magnifying the office, lest, like the Church of Rome, we come to think this office infallible, and thereupon grow up within our hearts pride and unjust domination, until the office become intolerable to the world. But there is yet greater danger in magnifying the man, lest there be begotten within us personal vanity and self-esteem. The danger now is in this latter case, not in the former. When the people now find among the clergy a man of *talents*, or gifts *of language* in preaching, or any *special arts of pleasing and suiting himself to their own minds and opinions*, then to him they give way in the lowest species of adulation and subservient following. They forget the *office as coming from God*, and lose it in the man of whom they make a favourite. Hence the great delight men have in pursuing popular preachers, rather than in humble submission to the practical authority of a parish priest; hence "itching ears" for novelties in distant places, rather than patient acquiescence in those set over them parochially in the Lord. Hence the clergy are universally looked upon by the *poor* as mere *gentlemen*, never as *priests;* and by the *rich* as mere servants, for the preaching of morality to the poor, instead of ambassadors from God, to warn *them* of repentance and His kingdom. Now, the part for you to do is to avoid

this low and temporal view of the ministers of God and stewards of His mysteries;—to look upon them as possessing the sacred character of the *priesthood*, and the apostolic character of the *episcopate*, and to speak of them, think of them, and treat them as *God's servants*, and yours, for Jesus Christ's sake;—to remember, indeed, that they possess their treasure in earthen vessels; but still that it is a treasure,—that they have something committed to them for your advantage; therefore, in the words of S. Paul, study "to obey them that have the rule over you: to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake, remembering that they watch over your souls, as they that must give account,"—and reflect, finally, upon these solemn words of our Lord, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth Me, and he that receiveth Me, receiveth Him that sent Me: He that heareth you, heareth Me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth Him that sent Me: He, therefore, that despiseth, despiseth not man, but God."

On the other hand, let us take a warning *for ourselves*, the clergy. If, indeed, we desire to realize the office which we hold; if we desire to be, not only members, as it were, of a useful and honourable profession, as a *profession*, but to be what the Scriptures say we are, and what the book of Common Prayer calls us, PRIESTS,—not to hold the charge of a *cure of souls*, as though it were but an office in a counting house of merchandize, for filthy lucre's sake,—not to take the oversight of the flock because it falls in with a family provision for our temporal wants, and —whether our hearts are in it or not—dare to say, that we are *moved by the Holy Spirit* to take upon ourselves the office of a priest or deacon,—if these abuses are absent from us, and we do really think that we have the power—as the Scripture says we have—in its proper meaning, and, according to our ordination service, the power of binding and loosing, and of remitting sins and retaining them, of keeping the keys of the kingdom of heaven,—of shaking off the dust of our feet against those who reject

us, as in condemnation, or of opening wide the gates of heaven in the glad tidings of salvation to those who will receive us,—if we have the "ministry of reconciliation," —if we are "ambassadors for God"—if we are fellow-workers with God"—if we have the power of giving to the people the laver of regeneration in the one sacrament, and the body and the blood of our Redeemer in the other,—if we feel that these things be true, or if they be anything approaching the truth, then, my brethren, what responsibility, what terrible, severe responsibility is laid upon us, —what woe, if we use not this power rightly, with discretion, with holiness, and with love,—what wrath from God impending, if we fear,—what indignation from God, if we flatter, or court men's prejudices, or shrink from suffering, or be ashamed of His cause, or look to consequences as regarding self,—what sure and dreadful punishment, if either from a false delicacy we withhold from the impenitent the doctrine of a judgment to come in all its fearfulness, or from the penitent the doctrine of an atonement in the blood of the Lamb of God, in all its fulness.

The minister of God is a *steward* of the mysteries of Christ. Woe be to him, if he be not found faithful. He is a *soldier*,—woe be to him, if he be not found warring. He is a *labourer*, a fellow-worker with Christ,—woe be to him if he be not found working. He is a *shepherd*,—woe be to him if he be not found looking for the sheep that is lost. He is an *ambassador*,—woe be to him, if he deliver not his embassage. He is a *watchman*,—woe be to him if he be found sleeping.

Are these things so? If they *are*, who is sufficient for them? O, ye among whom we minister, do not, in the lightness and frivolity of this perishing world, pass heedless by, and think of little import the responsibilities of your clergy; but in the words of S. Paul, in *his* ministry, "Brethren, pray for us." Pray for us, in your private as well as your public devotions; pray for us, that we be not found wanting in the day of the Lord. Do not add any discouragement, on your part, to the natural discouragements which beset us on *our own part*. Do not, by neglecting our words, or being cold-hearted in your affections,

or setting up your self-will, throw a damp and chill over the humble endeavours we make in your behalf; but by a cheerful acquiescence in the Church's authority, by your prayers, by your ready mind, by your alms-deeds, by your general good works, and labours of love, with us, and for us, shew to the world a spectacle of what the Church of Christ can be, when to her gentle voice her laymen are obedient, and her bishops, priests, and deacons faithful.

SERMON XI.

ORNAMENTS OF DIVINE SERVICE.

EZRA vii, 27.

"*To beautify the house of the Lord.*"

THERE seem to be two great principles in the works of God, and these combined,—the *useful* and the *beautiful*. We seldom see one without the other. Mere decoration or ornament, colour, light, or shape, without any purpose or meaning, we seldom behold; while equally, on the other hand, we do not find things of practical usefulness left bare, cold, or meagre, unsightly to the eye, unpleasant to the ear, or painful to the touch; but, on the contrary, as there is an object of usefulness in things the most beautiful, so there is a clothing of beauty upon things of the commonest use. Moreover in the works of God there is a richness and exuberance of ornament, not only in the grander parts of nature, but also in the details, which the mere utilitarian would make a subject of grudging. As in the case of our blessed Lord, when the observation was made, "Why was this waste of the ointment made?" so a mere utilitarian might very often say, of the works of nature, "Why is this waste?" In the colour and plumage of birds, the sounds of music, the shapes of bodies, the immense height of mountains, the numbers of the insect tribe, infinite, and living but for a day,—to the mere man of figures this great richness of abundance might appear wasteful. Yet it is God's will. When we compare the minuteness of detail, and the care expended on every single atom of creation, with the magnificence and boundless character of the

mass,—the pencilling of a mere flower, the wing of the smallest insect, the shape and texture of a common leaf,—with vast seas, oceans, mountains, the atmosphere, the stars of heaven,—then indeed we are lost in wonder, beholding God thus careful in supplying the children of men, not only with that which is needful, but also with that which is grand and ornamental.

Now if God has thus treated man in the works that are created for his benefit, it would seem a duty which man owes to God, to give back, as far as in him lies, the same principles: and so, in buildings professedly raised for His worship, and in systems of divine service specially planned for His glory, not to be content with a bare sufficiency of usefulness, but to crown and clothe that usefulness with such decorations and additions of beauty as come within his power. It has generally been the opinion of Dissenters and Non-Conformists, that any ornamental work in the Church is, to say the least, uncalled for; that a sound roof to shelter the congregation, and four good walls to enclose the congregation, are all that need be desired. Separation of orders of men by holy vestments, and distinction of dress, they deem useless. Painting and sculpture, carved work and emblematic devices, colour and sound, silver and gold, they would discourage and avoid as things tending to superstition. What is called plainness and cheapness seems to be their principle of action, forgetting the principle which God displays towards them by abundance, and richness, and cost, in every feature of His works.

But it is not right that we should be directed altogether by the analogy of nature. In *great part* it is right that we should receive suggestions from what we behold in God's works; but since these must at all times be the conclusions of our own reason, we must ever appeal to God's word for their verification. Let us do so in the present instance. In the ninth lecture, we spoke of the doctrine of holy places; in the tenth lecture, we spoke of the doctrine of holy men. Now if we apply the principle under consideration to these points, the questions will arise which will form our present subject,—that is to say, the

extent, degree, and character of the decorations which the houses of God and the men of God are to receive at our hands for divine uses. We set out with assuming it as an acknowledged duty that we should raise holy buildings for God's honour, and set apart holy men for His service; but are we only to consider what is absolutely necessary, or may we and ought we to add, according to our ability, that which is beautiful and ornamental? Our Prayer Book raises this question by the Rubric immediately preceding the Order for Morning Prayer:

"And here is to be noted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their Ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of king Edward the Sixth."

From this mention of "*ornaments of the Church*," and "*ornaments of the Ministers thereof*," we shall be led to speak in a twofold division on this head; first of churches, and then of the clergy.

The most cursory reader of Holy Scripture will call to mind the very minute directions which occur in the book of Exodus on the subject of the altar, the sanctuary, and the tabernacle. Not only were these holy things commanded, but their fashion and shape, their materials and colour, were all set down in minute order, and constructed with most lavish and profuse expenditure of things valuable. Gold and silver, and brass, and blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine linen, and goats' hair, and rams' skins dyed red, and badgers' skins, and shittim wood; oil for the light, spices for anointing oil, and for sweet incense; onyx stones, and stones to be set in the ephod and in the breastplate,—such are the ornaments and materials commanded for God's sanctuary. And then follows a minute account of the pattern of all the ornaments and instruments to be used therein: The *ark*,—its length, breadth, and height; to be overlaid within and without with pure gold, with rings and staves for the purpose of being carried from place to place. The *mercy seat* of pure gold; two cherubims of gold, one cherub on the one end, and the other cherub on the other end, stretching forth their

wings and covering the mercy seat, with their faces looking towards one another. A *table of pure gold*, with staves and rings, with dishes, and spoons thereof, and covers thereof, and bowls of pure gold for the shew-bread. A *candlestick* of pure gold, of which the shaft and branches and other parts are minutely described,—and it is said: "Of a talent of pure gold shall he make it with all these vessels." Lastly said God to Moses: "Look that thou make them after the pattern, which was showed thee in the mount."

All this occurs in the twenty-fifth chapter of Exodus. In the twenty-sixth chapter, the directions are still continued in the same spirit for the curtains of the tabernacle, their materials, colour, and form; the boards of the tabernacle, with sockets and bars; the veil for the ark, and the hangings for the door. In the twenty-seventh chapter, we have the construction of the altar, with its holy vessels; the court of the tabernacle, with its hangings and pillars; and the preparation of the oil for the lamp which was to be ever kept burning. But this is a mere sketch. No one can form a just notion of the minuteness and the care exhibited in these directions (given by God himself, remember), unless he read these chapters carefully through, and dwell upon them. Considering the imperfections of the arts and of mechanism in those days,—considering the very limited sphere in which the men of those days moved,—and yet to find such minute commands reiterated, may indeed be to us surprising.

But let us go on. After the exode, in which these directions occur, the Israelites became a great nation. First, David became their king, and then Solomon. In this period of their history, no less than before, we find the most lavish expenditure of ornamental work in the holy places of God. I do not now speak of the *building*,—its vastness of dimension, its mere architecture as a pile,—the immense number of labourers employed in its construction; but I speak now of the ornamental work only,—its *beautifying*. Every holy thing seems to have been of the most costly material; to us, perhaps, extravagantly so. The timber, cedar; the coverings, gold; the walls

round about, carved with figures of cherubims and open flowers; the floor overlaid with gold within and without. But let us take the interior. Among the utensils of the building, we read of the *molten sea*, ten cubits from one brim to the other, standing upon twelve oxen, three looking to each quarter of the heaven; *ten bases of brass*, and on the borders between the ledges, lions and oxen, and cherubims, with the most minute and elaborate work of wheels, axle-trees, naves, felloes, and their spokes, all molten; *ten lavers of brass*, each laver containing forty baths, with minor instruments corresponding; and then it is said, "Solomon left all the vessels unweighed, because they were exceeding many, neither was the weight of the brass found out". And the whole account is concluded thus: "So was ended all the work that king Solomon made for the house of the Lord. And Solomon brought in the things which David his father had dedicated; even the silver and the gold, and the vessels, did he put among the treasures of the house of the Lord."

So much then for ornamental beauty in the *house* of God. Let us turn to the same point in reference to the *man* of God. Immediately succeeding the account already given of the tabernacle in the book of Exodus, we find directions for the vestments of the priest: "Thou shalt bring holy garments for Aaron thy brother"; and the end and object of such holy garments is given in these succinct and remarkable words, developing the principle for which I am contending: "*For glory and for beauty.*".....".And these are the garments which they shall make; a breast-plate and an ephod, and a robe, and a broidered coat, a mitre and a girdle; and they shall make holy garments for Aaron thy brother, that he may minister unto me in the priest's office". Here then we have holy garments, ornamented garments, variously emblematic and significant; in one place said to be for "*glory and for beauty*", and in another that in such "the *ministry of God may be performed.*" But let us go on. Not only the thing, but the fashion, colour, and texture, is laid down. 1. *The ephod:* of gold, of blue, of purple, of scarlet, and of fine twined linen, with cunning work; and the curious

girdle of the ephod of the same, with two onyx stones, engraven with the names of the children of Israel. II. *The breastplate* of judgment: with cunning work of gold, blue, purple, &c. as the ephod; with rows of precious stones, "the first row a sardine, a topaz, and a carbuncle; the second row an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond; the third row a ligure, an agate, and an amethyst; and the fourth row a beryl, an onyx, and a jasper. They shall be set in gold with their enclosings." And in the breastplate so beautifully constructed and contrived there were to be: III. THE URIM AND THUMMIM, to be worn (observe the emblem) "upon the priest's heart, when he goeth in before the Lord". By this he was to learn God's will, and pronounce God's judgments; and it was to have a golden bell and pomegranates upon the hem of the robe round about: "It shall be upon Aaron to minister, and his sound shall be heard when he goeth in unto the holy place, and when he cometh out, that he die not." Then IV. *The mitre*, with a plate of pure gold upon blue lace, with a signet on the fore-front, engraven, HOLINESS TO THE LORD. Then V. *The embroidered coat* of fine linen. And all concluded with these words: "It shall be a statute for ever unto him, and his seed after him."

I have thus extracted the principal portions of God's word, in relation to the ornamental work of His service, but there is much remaining even yet. Very few people indeed read this part of the Bible. They think it tedious and unedifying. They have heard some few hints given forth of altars, and of ephods, and of mitres, and the like; but they are told that these are mere Jewish ordinances, not necessary for Christians to think upon. By a habit of reading only that portion of the Bible which is said to be "spiritual", they pass by page after page, because they cannot see upon its surface that it "tends", as they say, "to edification." But *principles are deeply seated;* not to be perceived on the surface. Not a single page is to be diminished from God's word. I would only ask of any candid person to read carefully through the books of Exodus and Kings, from which I have been quoting, and then consider whether there be not displayed God's will

as to beauty in the things of His service. As to Judaism and Christianity compared, the argument does not rest in this at all. They are of course different, and the details in each may be different; but as Christianity is only Judaism developed and made perfect, if we find such a spirit in that which is inferior, how much greater should that spirit be in that which is superior. The things of the tabernacle and the sanctuary are said to be, by S. Paul, "patterns of the things which are in heaven." And again, he says: "If the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not stedfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance, which glory was to be done away; how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious? for if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." So, surely it is. And if all this care, minuteness, and beauty, was commanded by the Lord God Himself to be extended to His servants, who were merely the leaders and teachers to bring the world unto Christ,—surely when Christ is really come, His houses of prayer, and His priests of the everlasting Gospel, should much more be clothed, as internally with righteousness, so externally with ornaments and holy things, for the ministration of their Lord.

The principle then being thus manifested in the Word of God, let us now proceed to examine how, as a matter of history, it was afterwards carried into effect in the progress of Christianity.

Bearing in mind the structure and division of the early churches, as described in the ninth lecture, let us now fill up that description by the following particulars, in regard to ornamental work.

1. The altar.* Upon this ornament of the church it has

* The question how far that whereon the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper is celebrated, is rightly called an *altar*, and in what sense it is so called, has continually exercised the pens of controversial writers. It will of course run parallel with the idea of a priesthood, and of a sacrifice in the holy eucharist. In whatever sense we recognize a priest in the Church of England,—in whatever

always been the custom of the people of God to bestow great pains. In the three first centuries it would appear that altars were made of wood; but after the reign of

sense we recognize a sacrifice in the Lord's supper,—in whatever sense we recognize an offering or oblation,—in that sense we must recognize an ALTAR. It is observable that one party in the Church will invariably use the word *altar*, while another party will invariably use the word *table;* and the probable reason is, that there is a difference in the minds of such persons on the doctrine of sacrifice. Field speaks of the difference between Rome and England, and yet retains the name of *altar:* "We have altars in the same sort the Fathers had, though we have thrown down *Popish* altars." Bp. Andrewes adopts, in all his writings, the idea of a sacrifice in the holy eucharist, in its right sense; and therein the name of *altar*. Bp. Wilson, Thorndike, Bp. Jeremy Taylor, Mede, Johnson, and many others, in the same way,—all the stanchest and firmest defenders of our Catholic Church against Rome. Bp. Andrewes says: "If we agree about the matter of the *sacrifice*, there will be no difference about the *altar*." Mede says: "The raised fabric appointed for the setting and celebration of the holy mystery, was the *holy table* or *altar*, for by both these names hath that sacred biere (as I may call it) of the body and blood of Christ been ever promiscuously and indifferently called in the Church."

Further, from actual testimonies of the Church since the Reformation, we have this name continually set before us. In the Prayer Book of Edward VI, it is called indifferently "God's borde," and "*altar*." In the seventh canon of 1640, these words are used: "The holy table is and may be called *an altar* by us, in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar." Further, in the injunctions of Edward VI, we read of "two lights upon the high *altar;*" and further still, in the rubrics of the Prayer Book from 1549 to 1552, it is directed thus:

"The Priest standing humbly in the middes of the *altar*."—"Setting both the bread and wine upon the *altar*, the Priest shall say".—"Then the Priest turning him to the *altar*, shall say," &c. &c.

It is true that now in our Prayer Book these expressions have been changed, and "holy table" is substituted for "altar" in our rubrics. But still there is a retention of the word in many public documents even yet. For instance, in the coronation service, the word is still retained, and in Acts of Parliament. In one so late as the reign of William the Fourth these words occur: "All such chapelries shall be deemed to be benefices, and be subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop and archdeacon within whose diocese and archdeaconry the *altar* of such chapel shall be locally situate." And the word is thus repeated several times. Here then, by a public act of the legislature, drawn up and superintended by our bishops, the use of the word being plainly recognized, no fault can at least be found with us for a general adoption of it in our theological writings.

Constantine, stone altars were very generally introduced. On the altar was placed what was called the ciborium. It was an ornamental canopy, raised in the form of a little turret, upon four pillars, one at each corner of the altar. The heads of the pillars were adorned with silver bowls; the top in the form of a sphere, adorned with green flowers; and above the sphere was placed a cross. In the early ages, images upon the altar, and pictures, were not allowed. A decree of the council of Eliberis, A.D. 305, forbids the use of pictures: "We decree that pictures ought not to be in churches, lest that which is painted on the walls be worshipped and adored."* In after times, however, pictures and statues were gradually introduced into churches, and became regular ornaments, confined, however, in their subjects, and their adoration most carefully guarded against. How far, in the later ages of the Church of Rome, such ornaments have escaped adoration in practice, I fear the members of that Church will not care to answer, whatever they may hold in theory.

The altar, whether of wood or stone, was not left bare. It was covered with a fine linen cloth in time of divine service, and at other times with palls of silk or tapestry. In after ages, the colour of these palls and coverings of the altar was varied with the season,—a holy and significant device; violet, for Lent and times of mourning; white, for days commemorating the Holy Spirit, as Whit Sunday; crimson, for days of martyrs; and green, for certain other seasons. Upon the altar were placed the holy vessels, which varied in material and workmanship with the wealth and ability of the people, sometimes being of glass, sometimes of wood, and at other times of the precious metals. Irenæus mentions a glass cup in the celebration of the eucharist. S. Jerome speaks of "ministering the body of Christ in a basket of osiers, and the blood in a glass cup"; but, on the other hand, we have an inventory of the holy vessels preserved in one of the early churches as follows: "Two gold cups, six silver cups, six silver water-pots, a silver flaggon, a bowl, seven silver lamps,"

* Concil. Elib. c. 36.

&c., &c. So that here we find that the vessels of the altar were furnished, not by any strict rule, but according to the wealth and devotion of the people. One other ornament of the altar not yet mentioned was the candlesticks. These we find in general use throughout the churches, and varying in their richness and ornament on the same principle. Besides the actual altar, which stood high and conspicuous above all else, there was in general a side table, for the holy elements and oblations to rest upon before consecration; called either the Table of Prothesis, which means "setting out," or the Table of Credence. Sometimes also it was called in Greek παραπαπεζον "side table," and sometimes in Latin the Paratorium, "the place of preparation." There were also the Sedilia, stone seats let into the wall, which the clergy occupied in time of holy communion; and in some parish churches the Piscina, or place for washing hands before consecration of the elements, and for emptying and cleansing the holy vessels. Such was the furniture of the altar,—all, as may easily be perceived, preserving the principles of beauty and utility.

II. We must next speak of the Font; for as the altar was that portion of the church in which the one great mystery of our faith was celebrated, so the font being prepared for holy baptism was the other; and as the altar was carefully separated from the rest of the church, being enclosed by the cancelli or rails, so the font was usually set apart in a place particularly dedicated to holy baptism, and called the baptistery. We do not learn much of the fashion or shape of the font in very early ages, because the baptistery being so appointed, the font was perhaps literally what the word implies,—a fountain, or spring or pool of water; but in after times, when baptisteries ceased to be built for churches, the font was placed either within the church itself, or in the porch of the church, and consequently assumed a more prominent character. Its situation at the porch or door of the external or temporal church would be an emblem that baptism was the way of admittance into the internal or spiritual Church. By an ecclesiastical constitution of the year 1236, a font of stone was required to

be placed in every church,* sufficiently large for total immersion; and the fonts were richly ornamented with ecclesiastical emblems of various characters:—The fish, ιχθυς,† as typifying water, and our Lord's name and office; the crucifixion; the resurrection; the dove, as typifying the Holy Spirit;—these, and such like devices, were carved upon the fonts, as architecture increased in skill and beauty, while very great care was also bestowed upon the covers of the fonts, corresponding in workmanship and ornament with the font itself.

* In the canons of 1603, we find a special injunction to the same effect:

Canon LXXXI.—"*A font of stone for baptism in every church*. According to a former constitution, too much neglected in many places, we appoint that there shall be a font of stone in every church and chapel where baptism is to be ministered: the same to be set in the ancient usual place. In which only font the minister shall baptize publicly."

The desecration of fonts throughout this country, which has been lately brought to light, is truly lamentable. It seems that the desecration of the font has generally accompanied the denial of the sacramental grace in baptism. The Church in past years has (in a great measure) neglected the full sense of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; and with this neglect, of course the holy instrument or utensil in which the sacrament of baptism should be performed would naturally be neglected also. Some fonts are found at this day in the garden of the parsonage, used as flower-pots; others have been removed from their ancient place, to make way for pews; and baptism is performed in a small bason of earthenware placed upon the altar. Some clergymen use wooden bowls;—others have them painted over to look like wood. It would not perhaps be credited that in many a parish church in the metropolis there is no font whatever. Until very lately, in one of the principal churches at the west-end of London, the quasi-font was drawn out by a sort of machinery from beneath the altar, and the baptisms celebrated at the altar rails.

No wonder, baptism, as one of the sacraments necessary to salvation, and as conveying the grace of the Holy Spirit, has been neglected and forsaken by the people, if the clergy have thus desecrated the font.

* The explanation of the word ιχθυς, as applied to Christ, is thus: Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς θεοῦ, υἱὸς Σωτὴρ—Jesus Christ the Saviour, Son of God; the first letter of each word forming the acrostic, ιχθυς, a fish; and herein representing our Lord in the waters of regeneration. From the Latin *piscis*, a fish, comes piscina, which was sometimes used by the Ancient Church as a name for the font for the same reason. Tertullian on baptism says: "We little fish are born in water, according to our ΙΧΘΥΣ, Jesus Christ; nor are we safe otherwise than by remaining in the water."—*De Bapt.* cap. 1.

III. In regard to other parts of the church, we find a very ancient custom of adorning the walls with texts of Scripture, suited to the different parts of the building, and this for instruction as well as beauty;* and very frequently inscriptions were made, not only of Scripture, but of ap-

* The general custom of our own Church in this matter is to inscribe the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, on the east wall of the chancel. In some churches, we find, in addition to this, texts of appropriate meaning for the holy office used in the chancel, and also, on the doors of entrance, texts applicable to a devout behaviour on entering. But none of these things are *commanded*. It is questionable whether the inscription even of the Ten Commandments is binding upon us. With regard to the Creed and Lord's Prayer, it is certainly optional; and it would seem, at the present day, when almost all the congregation possess Bibles and Prayer Books, that, as far as instruction is considered, these inscriptions might very well be omitted. Queen Elizabeth, in her injunctions to Archbishop Parker, does indeed speak of the Ten Commandments as to be written on the walls. She first describes the decay of churches, and the irreverence which had grown up as to cleanliness and seemly order, in such language as might very well apply to the present day:

"And that furthermore in sundry churches and chapels where divine service, as prayer, preaching, and administration of sacraments be used, there is such negligence and lack of convenient reverence used towards the comely keeping and order of the said churches, and especially of the upper part, called the chancel, that it breedeth no small offence and slander to see and consider, on the one part the curiosity and cost bestowed by all sorts of men upon their private houses, and on the other part the unclean and negligent order, and spare keeping, of the house of prayer; by permitting of open decays and ruin of coverings, walls, and windows; and by appointing of unmeet and unseemly tables, with foul cloths for the communion of the sacrament; and generally leaving the place of prayer destitute of all cleanliness, and of meet ornaments for such a place, whereby it might be known as a place for divine service."

After some further observations, the injunction continues thus:

"And further also to consider, as become, the foresaid great disorders in the decays of churches, and in the unseemly keeping and order of the chancels and such like, and according to your discretion to determine upon some good and speedy means of reformation. And among other things, to order that the tables of the commandments may be comely set or hung up in the east end of the chancel, to be not only read for edification, but also to give some comely ornament and demonstration, that the same is a place of religion and prayer; and diligently to provide that whatsoever ye shall devise in this disorder, that the order and reformation be of one sort and fashion, and that the things prescribed may accord in one form as nigh as you may."—The Queen to Archbishop Parker, A.D. 1561.

posite verses and sentiments from other writings. The roof also was very elaborately ornamented, being divided into pannels or mosaic-work, sometimes coloured, sometimes gilded, as Eusebius describes the church of Constantine: "The whole roof was divided into carved tables, or pannels, and all laid over with shining gold." And S. Jerome, speaking of the richness of this and other parts of the church, says that "the ceilings were golden, the roofs and walls adorned with marble, the pillars with their chapiters of shining gold, the gates inlaid with ivory and silver, and the altars filled with precious stones.* And as this richness of *art* was sometimes used, so at other times the richness of *nature* was called into play for the ornament of God's house; for the same S. Jerome tells us, speaking of his friend Nepotian, that "he took care to have everything neat and clean about the church, the altar bright, the walls whited, the pavement swept, the gates veiled, the vestry clean, and the vessels shining; and so far did his pious solicitude about these matters extend, that he made flowers, and leaves and branches of trees, contribute to the beauty and ornament of the churches.† Thus all things were brought to bear: men's labour and skill, the shining of gold and precious stones, on the one hand; and on the other, the simpler and yet more beautiful works of nature;—all were brought to bear, all had their different offices, in "*beautifying the house of the Lord.*"

It is quite true, indeed, that in after ages these principles were lost sight of, or rather were corrupted and spoiled of their simple meaning by unwise additions. For instance, instead of one altar we find several; the high altar indeed to God, but several other minor altars to saints, and specially to the Blessed Virgin. Instead of the simple vessels for the bread and wine, we find censers for burning incense; chrismatories, for holding oil; the pix, for holding the consecrated wafer in reserve for the sick; Easter sepulchres, for holding the body of Christ (imagined, at the anniversary of the crucifixion, by the doctrine of the

* Hieron. in Zechar. lib. ii. 8. † Hieron. Ep. 3, Epitaph. Nepotian.

sacrifice of the mass, to be really sacrificed again and buried, and thence to be raised out of the tomb on the Easter morning.) We find also the addition of three images over the rood screen. Instead of the ancient separation of the chancel from the nave by the cancelli, (which were ornamented rails, and in which indeed the cross might make a very simple and significant ornament), we find the image of our Lord on the cross,—that is, a crucifix; while that of the Virgin Mary was placed on one side, and S. John on the other, thus totally defacing the ancient cancelli, and introducing novelties unheard of in primitive times.

But these and similar perversions of the simplicity of the ancient furniture of churches were abolished at the Reformation. It is this to which the rubric refers, as appointing the order of the chancels: "*The chancels shall remain as in times past.*" Remembering that our present Prayer Book is the offspring of the *second* period of our Reformation, and that in the first Reformation these unwise additions of the Roman Church had been set aside, but afterwards in queen Mary's time restored, we shall then understand the meaning of the phrase "in times past." It is speaking in Elizabeth's and James's time, in reference to the times past of Edward VI. Whatever furniture or decorations had been by him set aside, are by this rubric *now* set aside; and whatever ornaments were by him sanctioned and admitted, are by parity of reasoning *now* sanctioned and admitted.

But there is one special ornament of our churches very much canvassed and misunderstood by our present people,—that of the altar lights. It may be worth while to say a few words on this particular point. I should broadly assert, on this view of the rubric, that altar lights are sanctioned, and not only sanctioned but commanded, by our Church. While the Reformation, as I have shown, and our present Prayer Book, by its construction, does not admit of images or shrines of saints for worship, or permit the setting up of crucifixes,—that is, images of our Lord in his agony,—or burning tapers before shrines of saints,—still our Prayer Book does maintain and direct the burning of two lights upon the one high altar of God.

It will be shown in the following manner. The rubric of which we are speaking is this : "Such ornaments of the church.....shall be retained and be in use as were in the Church of England in the second year of the reign of king Edward VI." Any person reading this direction, would of course refer to the second year of king Edward VI ; for whatever, either in practice or by document, could be shown to be the rule of the Church at that period, would be thereby shown to be equally the rule of the Church now. The words of the rubric are, not "may be", but "*shall be*," "*shall be retained*," "*shall be in use.*" Let us go back then to Edward VI. We shall find the following express injunction : "All deans, archdeacons, parsons, vicars, and other ecclesiastical persons, shall suffer henceforth no torches nor candles, tapers or images of wax, to be set before any image or picture, *but only two lights upon the high altar before the sacrament, which, for the signification that Christ is the only true light of the world, they shall suffer still to remain.*" Now we know that, *before* the time of Edward VI, lights were burned in the rood loft, and lights were burned in the sepulchre, and lights were burned at the shrines of saints. While, therefore, our Prayer Book distinctly abolishes all these, it as distinctly retains the use of the two lights on the one true altar. It is beyond question or doubt that the law of the land is embodied in this rubric, as well as the law of the Church. Therefore, the law of the land and the law of the Church direct these ornaments of the altar, quite as much as they do the holy vessels of the eucharist, or any other furniture of the Church.

But this, it may be said, is a mere *theory*. Well, let us turn to *practice*. In point of practice, every one well knows that in collegiate churches and in cathedrals the use of the two lights, according to this law, has been up to this very day universally observed ; as also in many parish churches within the memory of our fathers, if not of ourselves. Let no one then misunderstand this reverend and holy custom. Let no one mistake it for any imitation of the Romish Church. In fact, it is quite the reverse. In a Romish chapel you would find *many* lights ; in the English

Church, only *two*. By this we are so far from being identified with Rome, that we are known and distinguished from Rome. The two lights are peculiarly Anglican, as again the cross is peculiarly Anglican, being distinct from the crucifix.* All these ornaments are simple, and I would fearlessly add are holy and pure, to those who have holy and pure minds, to those who will hear the Church in simplicity and truth. I beseech you, my brethren, in this as in all other decorations of our Church, to reflect that we do nothing new, though it may appear new to those who have not read or studied these matters. Keep in mind the reflection, that our Church is not a new Church, but the ancient Church of the country, purged and cleansed of abuses which certain foreigners of Italy brought upon us for a time; that when we were, by God's grace, cleansed of these abuses, the things were *mentioned* which were to be set aside as abuses; and therefore that every thing which is *not* mentioned as an abuse, is still retained. Our altars and our altar palls, our two lights, our holy vessels, our fonts, our monuments and tombs, our crosses as signs of faith, our painted windows of various and harmonizing colour,—all these and the like, as simple in themselves, and of a spiritual meaning, remain with us,—relics of the ancient and primitive discipline. To these let us adhere, as true in principle, and according with God's will; by these let us abide, notwithstanding the outcry of Puritans and political objectors, as being of that spirit which enabled the saints of old to rejoice, not only in the usefulness, but also in the beauty of the house of their God.

Let us now proceed to the question of holy vestments; for in this the same principle is involved, and the same

* It is astonishing what mistakes persons of otherwise good information are guilty of, in regard to the figure of the cross used in our churches as an emblematic sign, not distinguishing it from the crucifix. A crucifix is an image of our Lord, *cruce fixus*,—that is, our Lord fixed and nailed upon the cross. The cross itself, *without* the image, is surely a different thing from the cross *with* the image; the one a simple emblem,—the other an image, and therefore, in the eyes of many, from fear of its worship, objectionable.

objections have to be encountered. I have shown from the book of Exodus what the commands of God were, in regard to the vestments of Aaron and the Jewish priesthood; so that as far as the Old Testament is concerned, we are at once satisfied. It must be confessed that we do not find in the New Testament anything commanded as distinctive of Christianity, in regard to vestments, any more than with respect to the building of churches, or to divine service generally. We are left to infer that God's will is, by reverting to the law, making such alterations as the difference of Christianity will of necessity involve. It will readily be acknowledged, that when S. Paul commands, in his apostolic capacity, that every thing in Divine service should "be done decently and in order," that *some* distinctive dress for the ministering clergy would come within the scope of this precept. And accordingly we find that very early in the Church's history ecclesiastical vestments, after the pattern and similitude of Aaron's, were worn by the different orders of clergy. "Divine religion," saith S. Jerome, "hath one kind of habit wherein to minister before the Lord, another for ordinary uses belonging unto common life." S. Chrysostom also speaks of the "white garment" of the priesthood. No doubt the importance which was attached to the vestments of the Church, as in all other matters, was very much exaggerated in later times; and too much care, perhaps amounting to superstition, may have been attached to them. It is not the place, in a lecture of this kind, to enter into the minutiæ of ecclesiastical habits; sufficient will it be for us now to remember that at the Reformation this matter was specifically attended to, and directions given for the future guidance of our Church. Our present rubric refers us, as before observed, to the time of Edward VI. Just then, as in the case of the two lights upon the altar, so in the question of vestments, we are referred by this rubric to the laws and usages of Edward VI, for our direction. When we do so refer, we find the following rules: For the *bishop*, in time of holy communion, a rochette, a surplice or albe, and a cope or vestment (that is, a chasible); and, borne by his chaplain, his pastoral staff. For the *priest*,

at the time of holy communion, "who shall execute the holy ministry" (that is, consecrate the elements), a white albe plain, with a vestment or cope; and for all the other assisting priests and deacons, albes with tunicles. In the saying or singing of matins and evensong, baptizing, burying, &c. a surplice is the dress commanded. At all other times, and in all other places, every minister was left at liberty to use the surplice or not.*

Here then we have, out of the vestments in use before

* The *vestment* described in the rubric of Edward VI is the *chasible*, and must not be confounded with the cope. It is a garment extending from the neck nearly to the feet, closed all the way round, with only one aperture, through which the head passes, made of wool or hair, sometimes of silk or velvet, and of any colour, principally white.

The *cope* is a sort of cloak, closed all round, with an aperture for the head to pass through, to which is attached a hood or cowl, in wet weather drawn over the head. It is a garment used in processions.

The *tunicle* is a loose robe, originally without sleeves, but afterwards with loose sleeves added, made of the same materials as the vestment.

The *albe* is a garment made of white linen, fitting closer to the body than a surplice, and generally fastened with a girdle, with the sleeves tight.

The *stole* or *orarium* is a narrow scarf, worn by deacons on one side, and by priests on both sides, of silk or satin.

The *pall*, of which we hear so much in the early contests between our kings and the Popes of Rome, is probably the same as the stole, only, when worn by bishops, wound round the neck, and hanging down in front and behind in a single fold.

The *rochette* is a sort of surplice, but its sleeves narrower and closer to the body, worn only by bishops.

The *chimere* is a sort of cope, with apertures for the arms to pass through, worn by bishops over the rochette, formerly, like the doctor's dress, of scarlet, but now of black satin.

The *surplice* is too well known to need description;—a loose flowing robe of white linen.

To these we must add, as ornaments of the clergy:

The *pastoral staff*, formed with a curve in the shape of a shepherd's crook, used by a bishop.

The *crosier*, an archbishop's pastoral staff, differing from the bishop's in terminating in a cross instead of a crook.

The *mitre*, a bishop's coronet.

Such are the ecclesiastical ornaments of our clergy. It is well that we read of them, and become familiar with their *names*, because by so doing we may become more familiar with the *things*; and possibly the time may come, in spite of the present clouds which hang over

the Reformation, a certain number selected and appointed, with their times and seasons, for the use of the English Church: — some peculiar to the bishop's office, as the rochette and pastoral staff; some peculiar to the ministration of holy communion, as the cope or vestment (that is, chasible); some to be worn by the assisting priests and deacons at communion, as the albe and tunicle; while the surplice, as that part of the ecclesiastical dress lowest in order, is appointed for the ordinary matins and evensong. To this ought to be added the scarf or stole, which, though not mentioned in the rubric, was yet continued in use, as the mark of distinction between priest and deacon,—fastened on one shoulder of the deacon, but flowing over both shoulders of the priest.

From the above account of the English vestments, we gather two principal points: 1. That there are certain dresses commanded, to mark each order of the ministry. And, 2. That there are certain dresses commanded, to mark the several times and occasions of the ministry. Now of all these habits, as far as the priesthood is concerned, the only one remaining in common use is the surplice. It may be a question how far we are justified in neglecting the requirements of the law in these matters,— how far the neglect of the cope or vestment in holy communion is justified in the priest and bishop; and the disuse of the pastoral staff, as the mark of episcopal authority. These may be questions; but certainly, as far as the *surplice* is concerned, its use as a comely and beautiful dress for ordinary ministrations cannot be doubted, any more than that the law both of the Church and the land directs it.

And yet there have been objections. At all times since the Reformation, not only the cope and other habits,

us, when we may once more behold them in our churches. We have only to examine in various cathedrals the monuments of bishops, and there to see how but a short time since these ornaments were habitually recognized by the people. I am speaking of times *subsequent to the Reformation*. Mitres and crosiers of gilt metal are suspended over the remains of bishop Morley, who died in the year 1684, and of bishop Mews, 1706. It is certain that mitres were worn by our bishops at the coronation of George III; and copes were worn even at the last coronation,—that of Victoria.

but the simple surplice, has ever met with harsh and opprobrious usage from the Non-conformists. They have called it a "stained rag", a "rag of Popery", and the like; and we all know too well how this Puritanical cry has been revived in our own day, and how pastors and flocks have been unhappily divided by this very question. But let us consider it in its real bearings. Let us examine it, without prejudice, by the canons and injunctions of our Church, and judge honestly for ourselves. The question is asserted to be: "*Is the surplice the right garment for the sermon*"? But the question is not rightly put in this shape. There is a mistake in the very beginning. Many sermons are preached without any allusion to divine service, as in our universities, in the public pulpit, and in former times at S. Paul's Cross; and even to this day many sermons, in common parish churches, are preached when divine service has, strictly speaking, terminated; as, for instance, in the service for evensong. In such cases it may be allowed that the surplice is not required; but that as the preacher comes not in the office of a priest, but rather in that of a lecturer, so the rules concerning holy vestments will not apply, and the surplice will not therefore be of necessity required.* The form of the question therefore should be,

* In many counties of England, the custom of using nothing but the surplice has been up to the present day constantly observed; and the congregations would be quite as much disturbed by the sight of a black gown, as now our London congregations seem to be by the sight of the surplice. Sharp, in his work on the rubric, though he certainly writes in a compromising vein, and inclines rather to the black gown, yet is compelled to allude to the opinion of bishop Cosin, who speaks "*of the constant use of the surplice by preachers in their pulpits*, in the *diocese of Durham*." A curious anecdote is related in a pamphlet lately published by the Rev. John Travers Robinson,—a Pastoral Letter to his Parishioners:

"Extract from the English Intelligencer of Nov. 1642.—Sunday, Nov. 20th, 1642:—This day there happened in the afternoon a shrewd dissension in the parish church of St. Andrewes Holborne in London: divers over precise zelots in the time of divine service, pulling the minister out of the pue, and rending off his surplice: but by the mediation and help of some good religious persons the said frey was appeased, the minister defended from danger, and these tumultuous fellows turned out of the church."

Matters do not seem to have much mended, since, in little more

not, "*Is the surplice the right garment for the sermon?*" —but, "Is the surplice the right garment for *divine service*, and in divine service *the holy communion*, and in the holy communion *for all that occurs therein?*" Now let us turn to the communion service in the Prayer Book. What mention is there made of any change of vesture throughout the service? The priest begins the service, standing at the altar, in the dress appointed by the Church—*the surplice*. It ought, strictly speaking, to be the albe, cope, or chasible; but, however, what is now in use, is *the surplice*. He proceeds in this dress until the termination of the Nicene Creed. At this point the rubric states, "*Then shall follow the sermon*". But it does not state that any change shall be made in the vesture of the priest; nor does it even state that any change shall be made in the place. The sermon might be delivered, as it was in ancient times, from the altar. A pulpit is a mere accidental introduction, for the better hearing of the people. The priest ascends the pulpit to exhort, persuade, or rebuke, as occasion may demand, instead of remaining where he was, in a place from which perhaps he could not well be heard; but still he remains in his office of a *priest*, though he add to it, for the time being, the office of a *preacher*. And so remaining in his office of a priest, and so continuing in the office of the communion, he remains in his priestly habit,—his surplice and his stole. Thus then the first evidence for the use of the surplice is of a negative

than two hundred years subsequently, we find similar "over-precise zelots" in the diocese of Exeter performing the very same sort of work. It is indeed miserable to think of the cramped and illiberal notions, not to say the folly or wickedness, of well-educated persons leading on the mob to positive acts of violence against a clergyman, for adhering to the surplice. The last three months of the year 1844 will present a pitiable tale for the reading of our posterity in the history of the Church of England. God grant that what little is left of consistency among the clergy may be preserved, and what little is left of the good sense of the laity, to say nothing of Christian charity, may keep its place. The times are very likely at hand, when our principles as priests of the Church of Christ will again be tested by confession. Let us abide it for Christ's sake, and suffer loss obediently, if needs be.

character,—that is, nothing is said of *any other* garment. There is no mention made of any change. There is no mention made of the sermon but as being a part of the Divine service of the communion. *Before* the sermon something is done as by the priest; and immediately *after* the sermon, something more is done, as by the priest,—namely, the offertory and prayer for the Church militant; and in neither case is any change of garment contemplated.

But now let us come to something more direct. Let us take the 57th canon. The following is the order there given:—"Every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish." Here seems, if anything, a universal direction. Prayers, sacraments, or other rites:—there is no exception whatever. There is no time in divine service mentioned when the surplice is *not* to be worn, neither is there any mention of any other garment which *is* to be worn. We may safely say that preaching is a rite of the Church, and if it be a rite of the Church, then is the canon at once imperative that the surplice should be worn. But again. Let us take the 25th canon. The order there given is as follows:—"In the time of Divine Service and Prayers in all Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, when there is no communion it shall be sufficient to wear surplices [of course it is meant that when there *is* a communion the cope or vestment is to be worn, according to the Rubric], saving that all deans, masters, and heads of collegiate churches, canons, and prebendaries, shall daily, at the times both of prayer and PREACHING, wear, with their SURPLICES, such hoods as are agreeable to their degrees". In this canon preaching is mentioned by name. The cathedral church is the pattern and guide for the parish church. What is right in the one is of course right in the other, and thus by comparing these regulations with the universal and uninterrupted practice in cathedrals, we find the wearing of the surplice in the pulpit as elsewhere, is rightly and fairly established by the laws of the Church. The cry now is for *uniformity*.

Men say to those few clergy who think it their duty to preach in the surplice, "however right you may be, you are breaking uniformity". The answer is plain. The cathedral of the diocese sets us the example. Let those who desire uniformity follow that example, and obey the laws of the Church in her canons set forth. Then uniformity will be gained. But they are not at liberty to speak about uniformity who say they must break the law to gain it.

But even yet further still. Let us consider the fourteenth canon. The following words occur:—"All ministers shall observe the orders, rites, and ceremonies, prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, as well in reading the Holy Scriptures, and saying of Prayers, as in administration of the Sacraments, without either diminishing *in regard of Preaching*, or in any other respect, or adding any thing in the matter or *form thereof*." The use of the surplice is confessedly a form—a form commanded in the Prayer Book. We are told in this canon that we must not diminish aught from that form—but how? and when? "*In regard of preaching*". Therefore how any one can justify himself in saying that the surplice is not to be worn, surpasses ordinary comprehension. Every thing points to it as the proper ecclesiastical habit,—rubrics, canons, and the practice of all places where order is professedly maintained, as in cathedrals and collegiate churches.

I have dwelt thus long on this subject—a subject which may appear unworthy of the time bestowed upon it—for this reason:—because so unaccountable a prejudice has arisen in the eyes of persons of a certain caste in religious feeling, against our poor and simple surplice, and with it against those clergy who faithfully follow what they consider in this matter their duty to the Church. People say, "whatever may be the difficulties of the Church at this present moment, it is surely puerile to add to those difficulties by contests about things of mere form such as the use of the surplice. Why therefore do not the clergy concede the point?" In reply, I would state my own opinion that it is much more than a matter of form,—that

serious doctrines and practices of religion lie hid behind it. Now if it be (as it is to them), a mere form, let them abandon their opposition to it as to a non-essential; but if it be not (as it is not to some of the clergy) a mere form, but a solemn question of conscience, in the *degree of their obedience to the Church*, then surely if there were a kind spirit of Christian conciliation in the laity, they would give way in their opinions, and suffer their clergy unmolested to do the Church's bidding. It is either a mere form—and unimportant, or it is not. If it be, then why should the laity resort to such an ungenerous warfare as that they did resort to a year or two ago to hinder its use? But if, on the contrary, it be not a mere form, then does it become the clergy with a gentle yet determined spirit to abide by their duty in spite of clamour; for if we ever are driven to such a condition as that our clergy, our bishops, and our curates, are to be considered as bound of necessity to obey instead of to rule, and to be subservient to the voices of a majority, as such, rather than to the discipline of the Church, then would I fearlessly say that our days as a Church are numbered. They that seek to please *men* rather than God, will not long abide in *His* service who sent them forth to teach and to guide. He that is unfaithful in a little will be unfaithful in much. How aptly does Hooker speak on this very point: "Were it not better that the love which men bear to God, should make the least things which are employed in His service amiable, than that their over-scrupulous dislike of so mean a thing as a vestment, should from the very service of God withdraw their hearts and affections. I term it rather a mean thing, a thing not much to be respected, because even they so account now of it whose first disputations against it were such, as if religion had scarcely anything of greater weight."*

But it is time to conclude. Let us turn away from these unhappy differences, in the hope that the Spirit of God may enlighten the hearts of our people, and bring them

* Hooker, Eccl. Pol. v. § 29.

ere long more cordially together in the unity of the faith and in the bond of peace. Let us endeavour to grasp in the mind the great *principles* of our Prayer Book—the deep-seated *principles* of religious devotion therein embodied—and we shall then be quite sure that in the details we shall not differ. It is because men do not study the principles of action, that they have so bitter a spirit against one another when they find themselves opposed in practical questions. In the present lecture my endeavour has been to show that the reason and foundation of religious decoration and ornament is religious *devotion*. If we could once agree on this foundation, we could then easily leave the arrangement of the superstructure to the Church, and leaving it in her hands as the appointed pillar and ground of the truth, cheerfully obey. When we contemplate the general tone and spirit of the mind in grown-up men of the present day, and find so many of an irreverent and indevout behaviour, may we not in some degree atrribute it to a want, when children, of those external calls upon the heart and the imagination which a beautified house of God, and a clergy duly habited, and ceremonials spiritually observed, would have been likely to engender? Take a little child, and place him in a bare conventicle to say his prayers to God, and then take that same child to one of our cathedrals, with its fretted roof and gorgeous altar—its painted windows, its long-clustering pillars, its echoing aisles, its habited priests and bishops—and then behold the working of that child's mind as to devotion and prayer in the different places. In the one he will see nothing more and feel nothing more than as though he had been in the common dwelling-place of his own house; in the other his mind will be carried upwards immediately by the very aspect and character of the place. In the one all would speak to him of cold and selfish earthliness; in the other, all would speak of generous cost and dignity; and God would be justly typified by the building, as a God of glory, magnificence and grandeur. "The church", says S. Chrysostom, "is a place of angels, a place of archangels, a palace of God. If thou believe it not, look to this table, call to mind for Whose sake it is set, and why. Consider

who it is that is coming forth here. Tremble with awe even before the time. For so, when one sees the throne only of a king, in heart he rises up, expecting the king's coming forth. And do thou accordingly thrill with awe even before that thrilling moment. Raise up thyself, and before thou seest the veils drawn aside, and the choir of angels marching forth, ascend thou to the very heaven."* Could a man pour forth such language as this, could he have a heart to utter it, unless the house of God in which he spoke it were a *beautiful* house? A man's devotion in prayer is invariably affected either downwards or upwards by the objects of sense around him. Let him continually behold the emblems of his faith, as in the cross, or in the font, or in the altar, and there the mind resting, he prays. Let him see holy vestments and distinctive emblems upon the person of the minister of the congregation, which shall mark who he is, and whence he comes, and what he does—and then, that man is thrown at once into the spirit of devotion, never losing sight of the duty he has come to perform, and the presence in which he stands. "The mind of man", says South, "acts with a corporeal dependence, and so is helped or hindered in its operations according to the different quality of external objects that incur into the senses. And perhaps sometimes the sight of the altar, and those decent preparations for the work of devotion may compose and recover the wandering mind much more effectually than a sermon. For these things in a manner preach to the eye when the ear is dull and will not hear, and the eye dictates to the imagination, and that at last moves the affections."†

* Chrysost. Hom. xxxvi. on 1 Cor.

† South's Sermons, quoted by Markland in his *Remarks on English Churches*, to which I beg to refer the reader, as a most valuable work on this subject.

SERMON XII.

PASTORAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH.

Acts xx. 28.

"*Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the flock of* God."

It is said in the Acts of the Apostles, that "they who gladly received the word of S. Peter, and were baptized, continued stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and prayers." And of those persons it is said, as forming the *Church*, that "the Lord added to them daily such as should be saved." Again it is said in our service for holy baptism, when with water in the name of the Holy Trinity the child has been baptized, "Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of *Christ's Church*, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits." From this we learn the true definition and meaning of "*the Church*",—namely a collection or assembly of men, not only such as are called to execute a holy office in the same, as bishops, priests, and deacons, but *all baptized persons*. Salvation can only come, according to Christ's law, by admission into His Church. But admission into His Church, by the same law, comes by baptism. It follows, therefore, that, in ordinary cases, all who use this way of admission are in His Church. Now this may seem so simple and self-evident a truth, that its formal enunciation may be thought unnecessary. But it is astonishing how many errors inconsiderate persons fall into, on the

subject of the Church; and into none more habitually than that of considering it to consist of the clergy only. The clergy are of course one portion of the Church, and without them there could not be any Church. The clergy form, it may be said, the higher portion of the Church; they are gifted with various distinctive offices, duties, and privileges; but they no more in themselves constitute the Church, than a head, however perfect and beautiful,—or hands, however strong and symmetrical,—constitute a body, without arms, and feet, and the other members appertaining. "For the body is not one member, but many; and if they were all one member, where were the body? Now ye are the body of Christ, but members in particular."

When, therefore, in the tenth lecture, we spoke of the Christian priesthood as of men set apart by special call and ordination to minister in the things of God, let it not be supposed that we spoke of the Church altogether; we only spoke of a *part* of the Church. And as with respect to the constitution of a body, by dwelling on one part of that body, we necessarily infer a remaining part,—and by dwelling on the value and importance of one member, we necessarily infer the corresponding value and importance of the other members, all reciprocally bearing upon each other, fitting in, and, as it were, dovetailing into one another,—so in the Church: having obtained our knowledge of the priesthood as an order of God's especial appointment, our minds must immediately be carried on to consider those for whom the order of the priesthood was appointed; and so to consider what bearing the priesthood, as one of the members of the body, has upon the rest of the members, —how, in respect of the rest of the body, it is to carry on its operations,—in what way it is linked with the rest of the body; and while we examine what the privileges and duties of the one are, at the same time to examine what the privileges and duties of the other are, bearing on each other as parts in the constitution of the whole.

Now this I purpose to do in the present lecture, considering one of the leading principles of the Prayer Book to involve the *parochial or pastoral character of the Church.*

Holy Scripture is continually speaking of the people of God under the representation of a flock, and even refers to God Himself as the shepherd of His people, as in the Psalms: "Thou leddest thy people like a flock, by the hand of Moses and Aaron." And in Jeremiah: "Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him as a shepherd doth his flock." And the prophet Isaiah, referring to our Lord, announces to us, as the peculiarity of His character, that "He shall feed His flock like a shepherd, He shall gather the lambs with His arm, and carry them in His bosom, and shall gently lead them that are with young". And our Lord Himself, referring to this prophecy in its fulfilment, says: "I am the good shepherd"; while S. Paul in like manner takes it up, and speaks of Him as that "great shepherd of the sheep"; and S. Peter in similar spirit calls Him "the *chief shepherd*".

But as our Lord was to show, and did show by His personal teaching, the pastoral character of His ministry, so we shall always find those who were afterwards to undertake His ministry described in similar language. There is a beautiful passage in Ezekiel xxiii, where the prophet, indignant at the wickedness of the Jewish priesthood, foretels the time when a better order shall arise, and by the ministry of Jesus the people shall be rightly tended. "Woe", saith the prophet, "woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture. Therefore, thus saith the Lord God of Israel against the pastors that feed my people,—Ye have scattered my flock and driven them away, and have not visited them. Behold, I will visit upon you the evil of your doings saith the Lord, and I will gather the remnant of my flock out of all countries whither I have driven them, and will bring them again to their folds, and they shall be faithful and increase. And I will set up shepherds over them which shall feed them, and they shall fear no more, nor be dismayed, neither shall they be lacking, saith the Lord." But of all the passages of Scripture which set forth this pastoral character of the ministerial office, none are so full of

affectionate feeling as that which describes the last scene on earth between our Lord and the apostle Peter. S. Peter had but just before most miserably fallen; had suffered his Divine Master to be led out to crucifixion and death, he denying that he knew Him; but now, in penitence and restored faith, he presents himself as once more the attached follower of his Lord. The same man that, before the crucifixion, cast himself out of the boat to walk upon the sea,—now, after the resurrection, girds his fisher's cloak unto him, and again casts himself into the sea. The same faith that caused him, before the crucifixion, to cry out, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God",—now impels him, when the question is asked, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?"—to reply, "Lord, thou knowest that I love thee." And then comes that peculiar reproof—so gentle, yet so full of meaning—the question thrice repeated, agreeing with the denial thrice repeated; and the doctrine is thus pointedly conveyed:—Thou lovest me? Thou professest faith and love beyond other men? Thou art an apostle that standest among the foremost? Be it so. Show thy apostolic office. "Feed my sheep." "Feed my lambs."

Without going further into the Holy Scriptures, these passages will be sufficient to show us the nature and character of that superintendence which our Lord desired to be vested in His ministers; and by consequence, the nature and character of the love which He would desire to be the mark of His flock, towards those who exercise this ministry among them. How many things we may observe! First, the nature of the teaching: "*Feed my sheep.*" Not strong or stimulating potions, which might bewilder and excite,—but *food, sustenance,* that which would give and support life; not displays of human eloquence given forth at long intervals, or the setting forth of metaphysical subtleties, such as the Gentile philosophers were used to set before their pupils,—but "food";—that which might be given every day, little by little; "*daily bread*",—that which might sink gradually into the heart, and being daily received, line upon line, and precept upon precept, here a little, and there a little, might create stability of character and stedfastness of faith. Secondly, the manner of

the teaching, as to "*lambs*"; not violent, overbearing, impetuous, tyrannical,—but as to the gentlest of God's creatures, tender, patient, watchful:—as to "*sheep*", the most apt to stray, and defenceless, of God's creatures; not slumbering and sleeping shepherds, taking their own pleasure, or consulting their own ease, but mindful of the wolf, ever on guard, guiding to the fold, protecting, compassionate, pitiful. And thirdly, by inference, the duty of the flock in this relationship,—that of implicit trust, deference, and love: knowing their own weakness, therefore seeking strength through those set over them,—not discontented with the pasture provided for them, and so striving after other pastures which might seem more in accordance with their own taste, and more indulgent to their love of ease,—but simply abiding in the place where God has called them, and feeding on the word with which He has blessed them, in all patience and submission of spirit.

On this pastoral character thus set forth in Scripture it has ever been the study of the Church to rear its building of doctrine and of discipline. The plan never was to leave the teaching of the people to accidental movements in certain localities, but always to act on a principle of systematic arrangement and subdivision. On this principle, from the very earliest times the Church has been divided into dioceses and parishes;—dioceses, with bishops and chief shepherds presiding over larger divisions of territory; and parishes, with priests under the bishops, having smaller portions of the population attached to them, whom they were to guide and teach, and for whom they were to minister in the Church's rites. The process of evangelizing a country would be this. At first we may suppose a bishop sent forth from the first seats of Christianity into lands of heathenism, just as S. Paul and S. Barnabas were sent forth by laying on of hands of the other Apostles. The bishop, however, so sent forth, was not like the Apostles, who were to return to the apostolic council as soon as their special commission was concluded, but going forth as a permanent and fixed pastor, he would take up his abode among the people to whom he was sent. He would

bear with him the authority of the Church; he would plant in the heathen land upon which he set his foot, the cross, the sign of the faith which he came to teach; and he would bear his pastoral staff, the sign of the nature of his teaching. The diocese which he would thus take under his spiritual charge would vary in extent with the temporal authority of the civil ruler among whose people he came; for we generally find in the early dioceses, that whatever extent of jurisdiction the king, or any deputy of the king, held, as the temporal governor of the people, such did the bishop hold as the spiritual governor. This we find in the case of Rome. Together with the vast extent of territory which that great empire held for many ages after the advent of Christianity, we find conjoined a similar extent of power in the Church; and very probably it is from this fact of the centre of temporal dominion being at Rome, that Rome so long claimed spiritual jurisdiction over so great a portion of the Catholic world. But as the great empire of Rome was broken up in after-times into separate national kingdoms and states, so would the Church become subdivided into separate national churches, each with its governing head in its primate or first bishop; and together with him, in each diocese, as circumstances might make it necessary, a bishop with his flock residing.

Now let us take the case of a bishop, as supposed, going forth from a country already christianized, to establish a Church in a strange land. He would not go alone, but joining with him some few of the priesthood and diaconate, he would establish himself and his companions in the principal city of the people to whom he went. In this city, as the first step, he would, according to his means, establish his cathedral, and in proportion to his success in converting the people, would be the duties of his few clergy and himself in public services and other rites. As, however, he gained footing and strength, and as in parallel course population would increase, so it would become necessary to contemplate a further increase both of churches and of clergy. The country people round about would also now be ready to embrace the faith of Christ, and this would form an additional demand upon him. How would

he meet it? He would call to his aid more labourers. He would ordain more priests. He would divide the town into smaller portions, and raise up a church in each, and for these churches sending forth from his little college of priests one or more as occasion demanded, he would apportion the duties of each. In the same manner for the people of the country villages round about; the clergy, still dwelling together in the cathedral city, and maintained by the cathedral endowments, would go forth as circumstances required them, to preach the glad tidings. This supposed case was precisely that of the early preachers of Christianity. The people who dwelt in the rural districts, were called *Pagani*, villagers, and from the circumstance of the rural population embracing the faith of Christ subsequently to the inhabitants of towns, we find the word Pagans used in opposition to Christians.*

* There seems to have been a confusion between the words παροικια and διοικησις. That which was formerly the bishop's diocese, according to our notion of a diocese, was originally called παροικια, signifying, in the primitive ages, the towns or villages round about a city. Bingham says: "It is evident that the most ancient and apostolical division of the Church was into dioceses or episcopal Churches,—that is, such precincts or districts as single bishops governed, with the assistance of their presbyters.....The ancient name for an episcopal diocese for three hundred years is commonly παροικια, which they mistake for a parish church or single congregation; whereas, as learned men have rightly observed, it signified then not the places or habitations near a church, but the town or village near a city, which, together with the city, was the bishop's παροικια, or, as we now call it, his diocese, the bounds of his ordinary cure and jurisdiction."—*Bingham*, book v, c. ii, § 2.

But the word παροικια seems to have been disused, and diocese taken in its place, about the fourth century. Hooker gives the following account of the process of evangelizing a heathen country, spreading out from the city of a bishop into the villages round about; and he gives us the time when first the distinction of parishes began to prevail, as parts of a diocese:

"Whereas, therefore, religion did first take place in cities, and in that respect was a cause why the name of pagans, which properly signifieth a country people, came to be used in common speech for the same that infidels and unbelievers were, it followed thereupon that all such cities had their ecclesiastical colleges, consisting of deacons and of presbyters, whom first the Apostles, or their delegates the Evangelists, did both ordain and govern. Such were the colleges of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Rome, Corinth, and the rest, where

But still, as time advanced, and now not only a few of the country people, but throughout the whole land, both the lords of the soil and the labouring population, their tenants and servants, became universally of the faith of Christ, a thirst for more constant supplies in teaching and for the administration of the rites of the Church would naturally arise. Imitating then the foundation of cathedrals by kings and royal persons, the different lords of the soil would ask permission to build, each for his own village, a church, and endowing this church with a portion of land capable of maintaining a priest, would seek of the bishop, instead of the wandering and accidental presence of one of his presbyters from the cathedral city, a resident and permanent pastor. And so the church would extend. In proportion to the estates of the great men, and in proportion to their munificence and liberality, would the village churches and the village priests increase; and just as a diocese would vary in extent with the jurisdiction of the different deputies of the king in civil jurisdiction, so would the village churches vary in their duties and spheres of action according to the extent of the estates of each founder. The priest exercising the jurisdiction committed to him by the bishop, would now be called a *parish priest*, in opposition to the canonical or regular priests, who still remained in the cathedral city, the companions and counsellors of the bishop; and the space within the local boundaries assigned to each church would be called *a parish*.

It is not necessary here to speak of various other modes, in which the Church, as she gained strength in the affections of the country, and in devotion to God, extended

the Apostles are known to have planted our faith and religion. Now because religion and the cure of souls was their general charge in common over all that were near about them, neither had any one presbyter his several cure apart, until Evaristus, bishop of the see of Rome about 112, began to assign precincts unto every church or title which the Christians held, and to appoint unto each presbyter a certain compass, whereof himself should take charge alone. The commodiousness of this invention caused all parts of Christendom to follow it, and at the length, amongst the rest, our own churches, about the year 636, became divided in like manner."—*Hooker*, book v, § 80.

herself—such as the monasteries, colleges, conventual establishments, and other institutions of the like kind. Sufficient has now been said to point out the *parochial* character of the Church, and the subdivisions of the pastoral office, all in their appointment emanating from one head, the bishop,—and all in their maintenance depending on the free-will devotions of the laity, in tithes and other oblations. What we have most need to observe is this, that the origin of the Church's local government in her parish priests, was not, as so many think, from the election of the laity, nor from the laity's commission, but arose solely from the bishop, as the source of unity and authority. If we supposed that in the progress of Christianity throughout our country, there had first been in the various parishes a number of priests, and then, that from this number of priests, for the sake of order, a superintendent or governor was elected (whether as a convenient or a necessary functionary), and that in this way the priesthood preceded the episcopate, and the bishop was after all little more than a ruler over others, we should indeed form a very deficient and erroneous notion. The fact is quite the reverse. Every thing in the Church springs from the episcopal authority. From the bishop, as the centre of unity, every parish priest takes his authority to minister locally in his parish. From the bishop as *one* (but always within the Church's rules, which are superior even to the bishop), comes forth every ministration and every minister, just according to the well-known saying of one of the Fathers :—"Do nothing without the bishop." It is not the condensing or growing together of many into one, but it is the expanding and branching out of one into many,—even as Christ our Lord said, "I am the vine, ye are the branches." Every bishop and his diocese is a perfect church in itself. From the bishop, presiding over the diocese, issue forth the priests to their parishes, and, these parishes increasing with the extent of the population, continue in subdivision until they cover the whole land. Then, so increasing, the laity within the appointed boundaries of each parish become the flock, people, or parishioners of the priest who resides among them. Dwelling toge-

ther in this unity and friendly interchange of mutual good offices, what sympathy and affection must be the result! The people dwell in peace, seeking at the priest's hands the offices of the Church; to him resorting for counsel in their troubles, and comfort in their sorrows; from him receiving baptism for their infants, teaching and instruction for their households, and looking for the last rites of burial for themselves when the hour of departure shall arrive; while, on the other hand, from the laity the priest receiving his maintenance in free-will offerings and oblations—in tithes and gifts offered through his person unto God, withdraws from all secular pursuits and means of gain, and becomes thereby separate from the world, and holy. He gives up his whole energies both in soul and body for the service of the laity in things spiritual, and the glory of God's name; they knowing him to be set over them in the Lord, and esteeming him very highly in love for his work's sake; he "watching for their souls as one that must give account," "reproving, rebuking, exhorting with all long suffering and doctrine." In this local and personal attachment,—this division of offices throughout the land, by which each priest is bound to his own flock, and each flock is bound to its own priest, consists the beauty of the Church system. This system cannot contemplate that any member of one flock should resort to the appointed pastor of another flock, by reason of some wayward fancy or some desire for novelty; it cannot contemplate that any one particular pastor should neglect the care of those over whom he may be set, in order to search for filthy lucre, either by holding two different cures, or any two different offices of the Church, leaving his flock to an hireling who would not care for the sheep; but it contemplates that both pastor and flock, preserving the line marked out by the providence of God, should live according to the discipline of the Church in faithful intercourse and sympathy one with the other. Thus would the idea of the Church in unity and singleness of spirit be developed according to the will and meaning of her Lord—a body with its several members:—if one of the members suffer, all the rest suffering with it—if one rejoice, all the rest rejoicing with it

—the invisible head, spiritual and eternal, being our Lord Jesus Christ, and under Him in each several diocese the bishop, His visible representative; then from the head branching out the limbs or members—the parish priests and laity—each with their several offices and charges corresponding, some to minister, and others to be ministered unto; some to teach, and others to be taught; some to give, and others to receive—yet all in one body, growing unto the head, and "knit together by that which every joint supplieth."

Such, my brethren, being in theory and intention the object of the Church's pastoral subdivision, let us now take up our Book of Common Prayer, and observe how in our own Church this theory and intention has been carried into effect.

First, then, we shall observe, in one of the prefaces, the general intention of a minister and people, as a flock, offering their prayers to Almighty God in conjunction. "The curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel" is directed to say the prayers of the church daily, and "to cause a bell to be tolled a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word and to *pray with him.*" Secondly, you will find the same spirit in the general directions running through the daily morning and evening prayer. Unlike the Church of Rome, which leaves the offices of prayer to be performed by the priests alone, and cares not for any junction with the laity, the Church of England will have no service without them. She ever contemplates an affectionate and intelligent observance of divine service by the laity in conjunction with the clergy, a social and personal presence of the flock, as well as the continued superintendence and direction of the pastor. Thus, you observe, commences the opening exhortation in daily prayer,—"*Dearly beloved brethren*", and the confession of sins, in which all join—is called "A general confession to be said of *the whole congregation* after the minister"; and so we read on,—"*The people* shall answer", "the *people* kneeling", "the *people* saying", and the like. Again, we meet with the same spirit in the office for holy communion. "If there be not above twenty

persons *in the parish* of discretion to receive the communion; yet there shall be no communion except four, or three at the least, *communicate with the priest*." All through there is the pervading idea of a flock and pastor, a priest and laity in affectionate union offering prayer to God, and never separate.

But independently of this union in time of public service, let us consider the directions which are given to the pastor for the conduct and management of the flock. In the communion office,—so close, so constant, and so faithful a demand is made upon the laity, that, strictly speaking, no man ought to venture to present himself at the altar for the purpose of becoming a communicant, unless he have first consulted with his pastor,—"So many as intend to be partakers of the holy communion shall signify their names to the curate, at least some time the day before"; and this corresponds with the invitation which is given to the people in the warning on the Sunday preceding. These are the words,—"If there be any of you who by this means [private examination] cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort and counsel, let him come to me,* or some other discreet and learned minister of God's holy word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness." From these two passages taken together, we immediately trace the intimate connexion which the Church desires to exist between the pastor and his flock, the one offering his ghostly counsel and the other

* Although the other duties of the Church are strictly confined to the pastor or parish priest, yet in this duty of confession, or seeking "ghostly counsel", our Church, with her usual liberality, permits another priest, "discreet and learned", to be substituted.—And this is well. In general, the pastor of the flock would be naturally the most fit person; but cases might arise where the person afflicted in conscience, or burdened by sin, might better seek another.—Many circumstances might cause this; and the "opening of our grief" to one whom, from circumstances of character or age, we might personally prefer, is a liberty which the Catholic Church has always permitted.

being directed to seek that ghostly counsel before he presents himself at the altar for the holy supper of the Lord. But again, in the same office of communion we behold the watchfulness and intimate knowledge which the priest is expected to have of every soul within his cure; for first there is a direction (see the second Rubric) as to what should be done with "evil livers" and those who have "done wrong to their neighbours"; and the curate is directed to reject from the altar such as are unwilling to make recompense for wrongs of which they have been guilty. Again (see the third Rubric), "the same order shall the curate use with those betwixt whom he perceives malice and hatred to reign"; and he is to strive to bring them to godly unity, receiving the penitent, but rejecting the obstinate. How intimate a knowledge of the daily lives and habits of his flock do these directions imply and demand; how watchful a superintendence, how faithful and assiduous a solicitude for their souls' health. And again, as this communion office thus points out the duty of the parish priest towards his parishioners, so it also points out, on the other side, the duty of the parishioners towards the priest. It does not contemplate that *strangers* shall be of this communion; it does not contemplate that stray sheep from other folds shall enter into the flock without notice or approval; but it contemplates "*parishioners*", and parishioners *only;* and in one of the rubrics after the office enjoins as follows:—"And note that every parishioner shall communicate at least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one. And yearly, at Easter, every parishioner shall reckon with the parson, vicar, or curate, or his or their deputy or deputies, and pay to them or him all ecclesiastical duties, accustomably due, then, and at that time to be paid." The same spirit again—*the parochial bond*, as before of service, now of maintenance, according to the most ancient method of the Church's discipline, by free-will offerings.

But now let us trace this feeling throughout the occasional offices of the Church. In the first holy rite—the sacrament of baptism, observe the unity of the flock there contemplated. Baptism is directed to be administered on

Sundays or Holy days, with this view, that the congregation may be assembled to witness so glad a thing as the regeneration of a human soul, and its admission into the flock of Christ; and it is directed to be performed after the second lesson, with the same idea, in the very midst of the service, and in the presence of all. After baptism, the next office of the Church is "the catechism." The Church does not leave the child either to grow or not to grow in things spiritual, by accident; but she directs the curate of the parish in these words :—"The curate of every parish shall diligently upon Sundays and Holy days after the second lesson at evening prayer, openly in the Church instruct and examine so many children "*of his parish*"; and the next rubric goes on to speak of "fathers, mothers, and dames, of servants and apprentices": in all which we trace some intimate communication and intercourse going on between the several parties ;—they are not unknown to one another,—they do not forsake one another, but are supposed, each with the other, to be proceeding in harmony and love. Next, let us trace the parochial connection in the service for marriage. Banns are to be published, that is, notice is to be given before the assembled parishioners, of the intention of persons to marry, and the presumption is, that the flock are living so much in union together, that they know each other, and will be able to declare it, if any impediment should exist against a marriage contemplated by any of their commnity. Observe the care which is taken of the parochial connection :—"If the persons that are to be married dwell in divers parishes, the banns must be asked in both parishes, and the curate of the one parish shall not solemnize matrimony betwixt them without a certificate of the banns being thrice asked, from the curate of the other parish."

And now again, to take a different service—to pass from a scene of joy to one of mourning—from festivity and gladness to sickness and sorrow—still the pastoral bond is maintained :—when any person is sick, notice shall be given thereof to the "*minister of the parish.*" It is not contemplated that even sickness shall visit any of the flock without the pastor being made acquainted with it. It

does not seem a matter of choice, but a matter of course. It is not said that any other minister is to have notice sent to him, but the minister of the *parish;* and it is not left to the curate's discretion to go to the sick man or not, but it is said as of a consequence immediately to follow from his love of the flock—"who coming into the sick person's house shall say." A diligent reading of the service itself will soon show that the same affectionate feeling is carried on throughout. Examination of the sick man, exhortation to confession, the moving him to be liberal to the poor, advice to him to make his will and make disposal of his temporal affairs—all these minute directions certainly do show the intimate care of the pastor, and the affectionate submission of the flock.

But let us pass on to something further. If we find the common offices of the Church thus speaking, how much more strongly shall we find the Ordinal speaking to the same point. Let us turn to the ordination of the priesthood. The bishop thus solemnly charges the priest about to be ordained—and let us by the way observe, that no priest is ever ordained to a *general* service, but always on a special title, and with reference to a special flock or parish, over which he is to preside :—when the bishop has spoken generally about the dignity of the office, he thus continues :—

> Have always therefore printed in your remembrance, how great a treasure is committed to your charge. For they are the sheep of Christ, which he bought with his death, and for whom he shed his blood. The *Church and Congregation whom you must serve*, is his Spouse, and his Body. And if it shall happen the same Church, or any Member thereof, to take any hurt or hindrance by reason of your negligence, ye know the greatness of the fault, and also the horrible punishment that will ensue. Wherefore consider with yourselves the end of your Ministry towards the children of God, towards the Spouse and Body of Christ; and see that you never cease your labour, your care and diligence, until you have done all that lieth in you, according to your bounden duty, to bring *all such as are or shall be committed to your charge*, unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among you, either for error in religion, or for viciousness in life.

And then in the questions which the bishop puts to the

priest,—questions, in the reply to which is involved something of the nature of an oath or solemn covenant with God—questions which it is impossible to conceive any one could lightly answer at so awful and momentous a time;—the same spirit of a local connexion is traced throughout. Take, for instance, the following:—

The Bishop.

Are you persuaded that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ? and are you determined, out of the said Scriptures to instruct *the people committed to your charge*, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scripture?

Answer. I am so persuaded, and have so determined by God's grace.

The Bishop.

Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God; so that you may teach *the people committed to your Cure and Charge* with all diligence to keep and observe the same?

Answer. I will so do, by the help of the Lord.

The Bishop.

Will you be ready, with all faithful diligence, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word; and to use both publick and private monitions and exhortations, as well to the sick as to the whole, *within your cures*, as need shall require, and occasion shall be given?

Answer. I will, the Lord being my helper.

The Bishop.

Will you maintain and set forwards, as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people, and especially among them that are or shall *be committed to your charge?*

And then further, in the authority committed to the priest as a preacher of God's word and a minister of the sacraments, it does not seem that he has a *general* authority committed to him—a discursive power to preach *anywhere*, or to administer the sacraments in *any* congregation—but it has special reference to a local and pastoral charge:—

"Take thou authority to preach the word of God, and to minister the holy sacraments, *in the congregation where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto.*"

All of which directly corresponds with the prayer which

night and morning we offer up to God, in the daily service of the Church :—

A Prayer for the Clergy and People.

Almighty and everlasting God, who alone workest great marvels; Send down upon our Bishops, and Curates, and *all Congregations committed to their charge*, the healthful spirit of thy grace.*

From this examination of the Prayer Book, taken in all its parts, the conclusion in every reasonable mind will be inevitable, that our Church does intend in her *system*, she does intend in *theory*, the most exalted state of Church membership which it is possible to conceive. But now the question arises, are this system and theory carried into operation ? Do the bishops and priests of our Church in *practice* fulfil this rule of life here set down ? Do the *laity* fulfil it ? Does *any one* fulfil it. We need scarcely answer the question. The violation of all that is commanded us, the utter neglect of pastoral communication, ex-

* It is not meant hereby that it is unlawful to make an ordination without a specific charge, because in that case there never would be opportunity for our general missions to the heathen: "For if so be the Church may not lawfully admit to an ecclesiastical function, unless it tie the party admitted unto some particular parish, then surely a thankless labour it is whereby men seek the conversion of infidels which know not Christ, and therefore cannot be as yet divided into their spiritual congregations and flocks."—*Hooker*, book v, § 80. It is of course clear that all the early bishops and priests must have been ordained generally to *functions*, not to *places*,—the function or office first,—the place afterwards, as opportunity served; and now there is the distinction still made as to the ordination of ministers, and the place where the ministry is to be exercised. The authority is given generally; and it is inferred that the authority is afterwards to be confined to a particular spot, when the time arrives. In countries already evangelized, this happens immediately; and then, when once the parish or local district is appointed, then it would seem that from that time all care and labour is to be expended on that spot, and the clergy are then not at liberty to preach or administer the sacraments in every place alike, still less in every diocese alike; at any rate, without special license from the bishop of that diocese. Hence it has always appeared to me an unseemly custom, as will be observed further on in the text, to invite strange preachers to our churches, or to suffer strange priests to exercise the offices of the Church, in marrying, burying, baptizing, and the like. The authority with which these things are so habitually and indiscriminately done, is certainly questionable.

cept, perhaps, in some very few instances in rural parishes, is so painfully and notoriously obvious, that we seem compelled to pass the whole thing by as one of those unattainable objects which it is useless now even to speak of. And *why* is it unattainable? On *what grounds* have we thus ceased to be what our Lord has desired us to be, and the Church has prepared that we should be? The simple ground is to be found in the gross avarice and selfishness which seems on all sides to be devouring this country. When I declare gross avarice and selfishness to be the main source of the destruction of the pastoral relation in our parishes, I do not wish to except the clergy. Alas! no. It has been, and perhaps is still, the leading vice of the clergy, as well as of the laity, to concentrate round themselves the mammon of unrighteousness; and to do nothing and say nothing without respect to the gain which shall be produced thereby; to live in the Church's offices for the sake of the temporal bread which the Church will furnish for *themselves*, rather than for the sake of the spiritual bread which they, in accordance with their solemn dedication to God, should give to others.

First, let us consider the *laity*. Before the Reformation, what goodly lands and revenues, what rich endowments and privileges attached to the Church on all sides. These lands and endowments were, by the rapacity of kings and nobles, taken away by force; and now many of the nobility and gentry of this land are dwelling in ceiled houses, and faring sumptuously every day upon the produce of that which should have gone to supply the Church, her pastors, and her poor. The spoliation of the Church, as a matter of history, is so notorious, that I need not dwell upon it now. We have only to travel through the country, and behold in every quarter the decayed abbeys and monasteries which are scattered over its face, standing monuments of the avarice and rapacity of our people. But how, it will be said, does this affect the question of the loss of the pastoral character of our Church? In this way. Pastoral care, to be efficient, must be arranged according to numbers. A bishop in charge of a diocese, or a priest in charge of a parish, ceases to fulfil, from physical inca-

pacity, the idea of a pastoral superintendence, either of his diocese or his parish, immediately that the extent of his territory or the number of his flock exceeds a certain proportion. But it is from the immense increase of the population of this country (and this of course applies in a multiplied ratio in large towns), that the want of pastoral care has arisen, and following the want of pastoral care, schism, dissent, heresy, and wickedness of every kind. Should it, however, have pleased God, that with the many blessings of our Reformation, this great sin had been spared, and the property of the Church had been suffered to remain, then in proportion to the increase of the population, would have been the supply of means, at this present day, for the maintenance of additional clergy.

And what shall we say of the clergy themselves? Here, too, what a scene presents itself. How fearful to think that until the very few past years, bishops and priests should have held, three, four, or five different offices in the Church in different parts of the kingdom, so cut off and separated from each other, that the duties of no one of them could be adequately performed. The odious name of pluralist; the unworthy motives which must in general be supposed to attach to him; the suspicion of avarice which must exist in every one's mind in regard to him, have done more to undermine the character of the English priesthood for sincerity, than any other of the many abuses which beset our system. The tithes and offerings of the people, meant by the law of God to attach to a resident priest, are, under this hateful system, taken away and given to one whom, perhaps, the parishioners would never see, but for the sake of fulfilling the requirements of Acts of Parliament in taking possession—while, in the place of him who was appointed over them in the Lord, a mere deputy or hireling comes, just to perform, in their cold and compulsory necessity, the offices of the Church. This custom, extending, as it did a few years back, to a great number of parishes throughout the land, would of necessity destroy all notion of a pastoral character. It is true, a deputy might fulfil the requisite duties of the incumbent as far as externals went, but then there could not be the

affection, the authority, the personal charge and love for the people which would belong to him only, whose life was fixed among them, as of right their pastor. And besides, nothing could compensate for the injurious suspicions, and the scandal inseparable from the fact of one man performing the spiritual duties, while another reaped the temporal fruits. The very suspicion of avarice begotten in the mind of the multitude would infallibly undermine the character of the priesthood.*

And so it has been. Multitudes in this country have

* It may be very likely said that the above are grave charges to make against our clergy. Nevertheless, I think a fair and impartial view of the history of our country, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, will fully bear them out. Many have been the attacks made from time to time against the system of holding a double cure of souls, and many have been the defenders of the system, as in part necessary, and in part useful; but it must be considered that the passing of a law by an act of the legislature abolishing pluralities altogether has decided the question of its inexpediency, even in worldly policy; while its error in point of religion rests on higher grounds. No one has stated more decidedly the objections to pluralities and non-residence, and at the same time no one has more earnestly endeavoured to defend their necessity *as exceptions to a general rule*, than Hooker. But however he may be a defender of non-residence in case of *exceptions* to a rule, he still amply asserts the iniquity of pluralities, and the evil of non-residence in general. "The residence of ministers upon their own peculiar charge is by so much the rather necessary, for that absenting themselves from the place where they ought to labour, they neither can do the good which is looked for at their hands, nor reap the comfort which sweeteneth life to them that spend it in these travails upon their own. For it is in this as in all things else, which are through private interest dearer than what concerneth either others wholly, or us but in part, and according to the rate of a general regard. As for plurality, it hath not only the same inconveniencies which are observed to grow by absence, but over and besides, at the least in common construction *a show of that worldly humour* which men do think should not reign so high."—*Hooker*, Ecc. Pol. bk. v, § 81.

He speaks of it also as "unsatiable hunting after spiritual preferments, without either care or conscience of the public good"; and "the placing of one clerk in two churches is a point of merchandize and filthy gain, because no man can serve two masters." And he says:—"Against non-residence, and against pluralities of livings, is there any man so raw and dull but that the volumes which have been written, both of old and of late, may make him in so plentiful a cause eloquent?"—*Idem.*

forsaken the Church, for no other reason than because the Church has forsaken them. Multitudes, unable to obtain the bread of life in the Church's way, have been forced to seek that bread in any way which might be at hand. It is but charitable to say that Dissent is not to be brought as a matter of accusation against our wandering people, but rather as a matter of commiseration. It is to ourselves that we must look. It is to the spoliation introduced by the Reformation in the sixteenth century, and to the neglect by the government of ecclesiastical discipline both in Church and state in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries;—it is to the grasping of the nobility and gentry after Church property;—it is to our clergy, entering holy orders for the sake of emolument, as a mere profession;—it is to the buying and selling of spiritual offices;—it is to the pluralist, holding sometimes bishoprics, and deaneries, and parochial charges all in the same hand, where there could be no possibility of performing the duties of the several offices in anything like their true efficiency;—it is to these facts, which tend to set the stamp of avarice on our Church, that we owe the miserable discrepance that confessedly exists between the Book of Common Prayer in theory and the Book of Common Prayer in practice.

But even yet—even granting all these deficiencies, which rather attach to the ages that are gone by than to our own, even yet, if we did but use the power and opportunity which are before us, rightly, and discreetly, much might be done to restore the pastoral efficiency of which we speak. In the first place, on the part of our bishops and clergy, be it said with all respect, much might be done by a voluntary surrender of what are called their vested rights; by an immediate recourse to the subdivision of dioceses and parishes, so as to create at once more bishops and more priests and deacons.* Pastoral efficiency is lost

* Mr. Palmer, in a pamphlet entitled "An Enquiry into the possibility of obtaining means for Church Extension without Parliamentary Grants," has made the following calculations, which there is no reason to discredit. He considers 1,000 souls to be sufficient, on an average, for the care of one clergyman; and taking this as the basis of his calculation, he proceeds thus:

"The population of England and Wales, in 1841, was about

by reason of the unmanageable extent of dioceses and parishes. Break down those dioceses and parishes into more minute sections, so that they may be brought within the reach of personal superintendence, and then the root

16,000,000, which, according to our assumed basis, would require 16,000 clergy." But there are 10,718 benefices in England and Wales, held by 7,565 individuals. To those must be added 4,811 curates. Adding the number of incumbents and curates together, we obtain 12,376 as the total number of the parochial clergy.—"But," he proceeds, "this exceeds the truth, because two curacies are not unfrequently held by the same person, and the incumbent of one parish is sometimes the curate of another; so that on the whole the number of the clergy does not exceed 12,000, which shows a deficiency of 4,000 clergy. But if we add to this consideration that many rural parishes are here considered, with a population of sometimes 80 or 100 persons, or from that to 300 to 400, then we shall find that many of the clergy above considered have so far *less* than a charge of 1,000, leaving the others to have so far a *greater* charge than 1,000." Thus it may be assumed that 3,000 clergy are engaged in the cure of 600,000 souls, which will give the deficiency of 6,400 clergy for the present population of England and Wales. Following up the calculation in this way for great towns, and especially London and its suburbs, we find it thus:

In London, the population of thirty-four parishes exceeds 10,000. But the parochial clergy are only 139.

According to the given basis of calculation—one clergyman for every 1,000—there will be a want of clergy for 994,000 people. He proves also at greater length, adding in the other parishes which are below the population of 1,000, that there were in London, on the whole, 1,151,000 persons destitute of spiritual instruction in the year 1831; and adding an increase of ten per cent. for the last ten years, compared with the very small increase of clergy, the enormous number of 1,425,000 persons are left without pastoral superintendence; and therefore there would be needed, for London only, 1,400 additional clergy.

Then, finally adding in the other large towns throughout the country, he finds the gross number of population without pastoral aid to be SIX MILLIONS, and the need of additional clergy to be SIX THOUSAND.

Dissent is of course not included in this account, nor ought it to be: for Dissent cannot be contemplated by the Church. If the Church had always done her duty, there would have been but little Dissent. But even if Dissent were added, it would in no material degree detract from the frightful picture of destitution which our country presents.

Now let me add to this (if it be allowed to speak of oneself) the case of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge,—a district of a parish in the suburbs of London, newly created, and indeed one of the most wealthy suburbs of the metropolis. A population of 12,000 is committed to

of the evil is at once reached. If mention is made now of subdividing parishes, the reply is "we cannot touch the vested rights of the rector, or patron."* The amount of fees and of pecuniary compensation is set in the balance against the salvation of souls. The poor and ignorant surely have a vested right in the ministrations of the Church. Why should we not consider *their* vested rights as well as our own? This cannot be well. It bears the same tone of self-seeking that we have to blame in the pluralist of the last century. If mention is made of subdividing dioceses,—because the bishops, as they are now constituted, have no power to manage or control their dioceses,—it being well known, as a matter of general consent, that half the clergy in any diocese are personally even unknown to their diocesan, and the great mass of the

this church,—a section of a section of a parish. To this population, extending in a line of upwards of a mile in length, there are contemplated to be two clergymen. It is true there *are* three; but two only are contemplated. Two clergymen to 12,000 souls!—six thousand to each! Is it within the range of possibility that any spiritual good can be done? I put aside Church services,—I put aside the question of church room—nearly the whole of the church being shut up in little enclosures, with doors which bar out the poor, and with free seats which are occupied by the rich;—I put aside all this; but for administering the sacraments, for visiting the sick and poor, for the instruction of the grossly ignorant and vicious, to gain any the slightest hold upon the affections, even to gain the *acquaintance*, of this vast mass of people, is as absurd to think upon, as it is hopeless to attempt. Granting that there are now three priests in this section of a parish, we ought, according to Mr. Palmer's calculation, to have NINE more clergy,—say at least THREE more priests, and SIX deacons. Fearful must be the picture of the eastern parts of London, when thus fearful is that of the more favoured western portion. And yet I hardly know whether it *be* more favoured; for here there are the rich dwelling in ceiled houses, and, with the exception of a few, they care for none of these things, while the poor are perishing; but in the east there are no rich, comparatively speaking; so that the contrast of Dives and Lazarus is not so appalling, nor are the many Gallios so prominent.

* One noble exception must not pass unrecorded,—the division of the parish of Leeds. Here we find an example, a truly noble and Christian example, in the vicar, Dr. Hook, who surrenders, I believe, nearly half his income, for the sake of constituting a more complete pastoral superintendence of his parish. But how many have followed him?

people never even see a bishop,—then we are met with observations about the *house of Lords*, and the difficulty of arranging the rank and degree of any additional bishops. But we have yet to learn that it is necessary to the office of a bishop that he should have a seat in the House of Lords. We do not learn this necessity from the early Churches; and though, for the respect and dignity of the office, it is becoming that it should be so, still some few might represent the rest; and suffragan bishops might take a share in the arduous and momentous duties which now overwhelm the chief pastors of our Church. Let the priests, then, part with their present vested rights, as they are called; that is, in plain language, let them make some pecuniary sacrifice. Let the bishops, as a body, urge upon the state a subdivision of their dioceses, and let them part with that sort of temporal honour and notoriety which now marks them out as being few in number.* Let these two points be conceded by the clergy,

* As we have spoken in the note above of the necessary increase of priests and deacons, so in exact proportion must we observe on the necessary increase of bishops. Is it not a matter of absurdity, in a mere statistical point of view, that there should have been an increase of population so immense within the last three centuries as from three millions to sixteen millions, and yet that we should have precisely the same number of bishops now as at the Reformation? And, not only this, but where opportunity is offered, and funds are ready, instead of *adding* bishoprics, the legislature proceeds to join two in one.

Italy and the adjoining states have a population of 24,000,000. They have 270 bishops. England has 16,000,000, and has but 26 bishops. By calculating the number of souls in each bishop's charge, in comparison with other Catholic countries, we find that in Italy a bishop has 88,000 persons in his jurisdiction; while in England a bishop has 615,000! Consider one of the duties of a bishop—*confirmation*. How can he rightly perform this duty among the children which exist in a population of 615,000? And in the other duties—the knowledge which he ought to possess of his clergy—how is it possible to attempt it? A triennial visitation will not effect it: an occasional sermon in their churches will not effect it. Where are the younger clergy, the curates and deacons, who need so much the episcopal control, pastoral friendship, and paternal advice of their bishop? After laying on of hands, they are seldom seen by him, and perhaps not even remembered by name. The machinery of archdeacons, and rural deans, and the other devices for executing *parts* of the episcopal office, will not make up for the want of the bishop himself. These

and the pastoral office will once more be brought into the light.

And as to the laity, much, very much may also be done by them. They have also many habits totally destructive of the pastoral character of the Church. Suffer me to allude to these, and then conclude.

In the first place, there might be a greater amount of intercourse on a friendly and affectionate footing between the parish priest and his parishioners. They might learn to look upon him less in the light of a mere well-educated gentleman, and more in the light of a priest whose office it is to minister in the things of God,—a pastor whose office it is to guide, to teach, and to counsel his flock. They might acquire the habit of referring to him, more than they do, for advice in questions of conscience, in confession of sins, and in spiritual difficulties of every kind.

In the second place, they might avoid the evil habit of wandering about from place to place, and of making their Church duties mere occasions of excitement, rather than staid and sober actions of devotion ; so that the priest, by beholding them stedfast in breaking of bread and prayers, might be encouraged and urged on in his labours, seeing in their faithful adherence to their own parish the fruits of his exertions.

In the third place, in the various offices of the Church, such as baptism, holy matrimony, and the like, they might avoid the habit, now so prevalent, of seeking out some personal friend or relation to perform these offices, in the place of him who ought to stand to them, as their parish priest, in a higher capacity, because a spiritual one, than

are, as Mr. Palmer says, in the pamphlet above alluded to, merely *human* appointments, while a bishop is of *divine* appointment. A plan might be devised without much difficulty, were there but a willing people to carry it into effect, to add at least one hundred bishops to those at present existing; and these might be suffragan bishops, and so need not claim any rank of nobility or to sit in the house of Lords, but only execute those endearing, affectionate pastoral duties which the people of England, by their very nature, love. We all cry out for the need of this. Why do we not exert ourselves to bring it about? Where is the governor of the people, where is any one member of the legislature,—knowing as all must these fearful deficiencies,—that has had the courage even to agitate the question?

any mere earthly friend, or favourite, or even relation. Let him whose office it is, perform the office. In the things of religion, no presence should be so welcome, and so gladly hailed as that of the pastor who daily feeds them with the bread of prayer, and of the Holy Eucharist,—who is ever with them and by them,—with whom they join, or ought to join, in the daily services of each passing day. It would seem an unkind thing (supposing the Church system were efficiently carried into operation), to prefer another in any office of the Church, to him whose affections would lead him to care for his flock in all the circumstances of life which might affect them. The bringing of strange clergymen to the church is quite opposed to the spirit of our prayer-book, and is without authority in every respect. No priest has any power or right to administer any holy office, except "in the congregation where he is lawfully appointed thereunto."

And lastly in regard to *preaching*. In this both clergy and people are equally to blame. The love, which both equally display for the excitement of sermons, tends more than anything to weaken and destroy the pastoral character. How constantly we see bills and placards posted upon church doors, exhibiting the names of great preachers for the succeeding week. When alms are to be collected for any purpose of charity, we forsake the ancient and simple way of the offertory, and resort to the novelty and excitement of a great preacher; and thus on the one hand the preacher is to be brought away from his own proper ministry, leaving his own flock to do as they best can without him; while on the other hand the proper pastor of the flock is set aside to make way for the superior attractions of one who is neither known to, nor himself knows the people before whom he comes. It is very remarkable that in proportion to the maintenance of the pastoral character of a parish or the surrender of that character, is the success or failure of all ministerial labours. There is, indeed, a success of temporary brilliancy in the office of a preacher, as distinct from that of a pastor —the visible success of overflowing congregations, and large audiences of people; but this just marks its difference from the quiet, gentle, and gradual efficiency of the

teaching of the parish priest: the preacher merely affects the imagination or the intellect, the pastor influences the heart and life; the one acts by excitement, the other by love: the one sends forth his hearers, as an *audience*, gratified, very possibly, but without a thought or purpose of moral improvement: the other, acts upon his flock by an influence not seen at first, nor valued, nor even thought of, perhaps, but beginning from little, growing steadily onwards, and diving deeper into the heart day by day, by the ministrations of the Church, and the operations of the Holy Spirit through them conveyed.

I do not mean to decry the value of preaching altogether. Preaching is a constituent part of the parish priest's constant duty; but then it is only a *part*—it is not the whole, and its main value and efficacy rests in its being the preaching of the *pastor*, and not of a *stranger*. It may indeed be true that the preacher, merely as such, by the truth and vigour of his preaching, may by God's grace awaken for a time, or stir up into sudden exertion, some who are merely acquainted with him by *hearing;* but still the general character of those hearers, if they are *only* hearers, may suffer no material change. They may still slumber on in their habitual unconcern, and words heard may be words forgotten; and, until the *pastoral* office comes into play, following up the preaching, it may all be, and generally is, an idle dream. Speaking of course with exceptions, those who do nothing more than listen to great preachers, often listen without any benefit gained. Their hearts may receive no purification, their faith acquire no stability, their tempers learn no control, their habits undergo no change. Self-deceiving and deceived, they may seek their preacher on a Sunday, but being no more than a preacher, the food that he has to give them will not eventually satisfy. "Prophecy smooth words", they will cry, as certain did of old; and smooth words he will prophecy, in order to gain their favour; and all the ruggedness and asperity and self-sacrificing duties of the Gospel—the crosses, afflictions, fastings, self-denials, hardnesses of Christianity, will meet with no place in his doctrine, for he is to them no more than an accidental orator once a-week, and he has no love for them, and

though he see the wolf clearly enough, he fleeth and will not encounter him in their behalf, for he knows not their voice, neither they his, and they will not follow him, nor he them, neither will he lay down his life for them, for he loveth them not. But *add*, to the office of the preacher, the *pastoral* responsibility of a flock, with which the Church intends him to be invested; then will weekly preaching change into daily teaching,—an eight days' audience into an every-day conversation, — prayer once a week in a cold formality, into joint prayers every morning and joint prayers every evening, — his will be a continual presence among them, close about and with them, ever to be seen, ever to be found. Being their pastor, his counsel will be ever ready for the perplexed; his comforting words for the sorrowful; his strength and support for the weak; his alms for the poor; his peace-making for the litigious; his teaching for the children; his prayers for the sick; his blessing for the dying; his consecration, and giving up to God of the dead. In these works he cannot fail to know them; and knowing them, to love them, and they him; and diving into their habits and ways, he learns their hearts, and finds out their sins, and knows where the medicine must be given, and the wound healed, and the diseased limb cut off, and the balm of God's word applied: "*He giveth his life for the sheep*", that is, he gives up all for them. Even their favour he will part with, for their salvation. Even their good will he will forfeit, if good will is to be purchased by abandonment of their spiritual interest. He will speak the truth, though they be offended. He will cry aloud, and spare not, though they may turn away. And although it may happen in his ministry that there shall not be that tumultuous excitement of a glad hearing of God's word by public preaching, yet shall there be a more tranquil performance of its requirements in daily life; and although the brilliancy of external show be absent, it shall be more than compensated by an abiding holiness, a steady devotion, and a well-disciplined faith, pervading the aggregate of his people, over whom and with whom he stands as, under God, their pastor and their friend.

SERMON XIII.

THE CHORAL SERVICE.

2 CHRON. v, 13.

"*They lifted up their voices with the trumpets and cymbals, and instruments of music, and praised the Lord.*"

POETRY and music have ever been the handmaids of religion. Triumph, gratitude, exultation, hope,—as well as the depressing passions of the mind, sorrow and grief,—have ever expressed themselves among the people of God in religious songs. The first song on record in Holy Scripture is that of Moses, after he had passed the Red Sea in triumph with the children of Isarel. He and Miriam the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, seem to have composed a sort of antiphonal psalm, as a religious service of thanksgiving. Moses said: "I will sing unto the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously". And Miriam answered: "Sing ye to the Lord, for He hath triumphed gloriously; the horse and his rider hath He thrown into the sea." Another song we find in the thirty-second chapter of Deuteronomy. It is when Moses is about to give up his government to Joshua: "Give ear, O ye heavens, and I will speak: and hear, O earth, the words of my mouth." Another song of triumph we find in the fifth chapter of Judges: "Then sang Deborah and Barak, the son of Abinoam, on that day, saying, Praise ye the Lord, for the avenging of Israel." All these are the outpourings of praise permitted and directed by Almighty God as religious offerings to Him.

And this spirit was extended all along the Jewish history, until we find in the Psalms of David, the first and sublimest book of poetry in the world; and poetry

necessarily, from its character and its use, joined with music. The psalm of David provoked the harp of David. They went together. All the great subjects of the human mind, its passions, weaknesses, and sins; all the sources of religious emotion, repentance in sorrow, and turning back to God in faith; all the great subjects of God's creation,—His wonderful providence, His immeasurable and inexhaustible love for man, the depth and grandeur of His works; history, in regard to His past dealings with Israel, and prophecy announcing the sufferings and the glory of Messiah;—all these subjects are combined in such infinite variety, and placed before us with such chaste poetic imagery, that they have stood, from the time of their inspired composition up to this hour, as the purest model of the praises of God within the compass of man's language. And let it be observed that this poetry of "the sweet Psalmist of Israel" was, of necessity, according to the Hebrew use, combined with music for divine service. The titles of the Psalms in the version of the Bible will show this: as in the fourth Psalm, "*To the chief musician on Neginoth*", or the twenty-second, "*To the chief musician upon Aijeleth Shahar*",—these words probably being the names of musical instruments. The rhythm and flow of the language will also show this; and the general correspondence or parallelism of verse with verse all mark that character of poetical feeling which was meant to be, and, as we know, *was* in fact, by David himself and his choir, joined with musical intonation. Let us read the sixteenth chapter of the first book of Chronicles: "He appointed certain of the Levites to minister before the ark of the Lord, and to record, and thank, and praise the Lord God of Israel. Asaph the chief, and next to him Zechariah, Jeiel, and Shemiramoth, and Jehiel, and Mattithiah, and Eliab, and Benaiah, and Obed-edom; and Jeiel with psalteries and with harps; but Asaph made a sound with cymbals. Benaiah also, and Jahaziel, the priests, with trumpets continually before the ark of the covenant of God." Here then was a choir in its full and complete sense, and here was the choral service performed by the Levites and priests, "as every day's work required"; and

this, we must remember, "*before the ark*", for the Temple was not yet built. But the ark was the house of God. "*Before the ark*" was the expression used for divine service; and how beautifully, how majestically, and yet with all the simplicity of the ancient music, must the psalm of the prophet David have been poured forth by his trained and practised choristers: "Give thanks unto the Lord, call upon His name, make known his deeds among the people. Sing unto Him, sing psalms unto Him, talk ye of all His wondrous works."

But next to David came Solomon, whose first care it was, in the building of the Temple and the preparation of its services, to provide singers, who should sing in course, and musical instruments of infinite variety and number, to sound the praises of God. Thus it is said: "And the Levites, which were the singers all of them of Asaph, of Heman, of Jehuthun, with their sons and their brethren, being arrayed in white linen, having cymbals, and psalteries, and harps, stood at the east end of the altar, and with them an hundred and twenty priests, sounding with trumpets; and it came to pass, as the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking the Lord; and when they lifted up their voices with the trumpets, and cymbals, and instruments of music, and praised the Lord, saying, For He is good, for His mercy endureth for ever,—that then the house was filled with a cloud, even the house of the Lord, so that the priests could not stand to minister by reason of the cloud, for the glory of the Lord had filled the house of God." This took place in the consecration of the temple, and herein we see: first, God's approval of this method of His praise; and secondly, God's answer to this method of His praise. By His own approval, music and psalmody formed part of His worship, and His glory came down and filled the house, in reply to the praises of man thus offered. And the same was ever afterwards the method of Divine worship among the Jews. If religion ever died away, as it did several times in their subsequent history, then the musical praises of God died away with it. If religion was ever restored by any of the better kings, then as surely we

find the musical service carefully rearranged, as essential to its perfection. Josiah made it his care to place "the singers, the sons of Asaph, in their place, according to the commandment of David." When the children of Israel were in captivity, part of their lamentation was that they could not "sing the Lord's song in a strange land." They "wept when they remembered Zion, and hanged their harps upon the willows in the midst thereof." And then Ezra, on the restoration, "when the builders laid the foundation of the temple of the Lord, set the priests in their apparel, with trumpets, and the Levites, the sons of Asaph, with cymbals, to praise the Lord, after the ordinance of David, king of Israel."

So far then, by looking to the Jewish history, there can be no difference of opinion on the subject of the musical praise of God in Divine worship. And if the Jew had subjects for praise, shall the Christian be without them? If the sons of Asaph and the Levites sang in the *Temple*, shall the sons of God in Christ and the ministers of the Holy Spirit be silent in the *Church?* No. We have full proof that the New Covenant is not inferior to the Old in the praises of God. The very first intimation of the Gospel was made by psalmody, for "there was a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying, Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will towards men"; and many of those persons who were engaged in testifying to the coming of the Messiah, in receiving him, or in announcing him, gave vent to their feelings in holy song. As, for instance, the Blessed Virgin—she had her special hymn—"My soul doth magnify the Lord"; and Zacharias, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel"; and the aged Simeon, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word." And moreover, as was the commencement of our Lord in his holy office as Messiah, so was its termination; for the apostles of our Lord, and our Lord Himself, in the most holy rite of our religion, did but think that the voice of psalmody and singing was a right fulfilment of worship in that service, and after the pattern of the Jews at the Passover, before they went out into the Mount of Olives, "they sang an hymn." Psal-

mody too was the occupation of Paul and Silas when imprisoned at Philippi. And in the Epistles we have many injunctions as to this religious observance, such as in the Epistle to the Colossians: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs; singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Nor is heaven itself without its testimony to the sacredness of song, and choirs of holy angels are continually described in S. John's Apocalypse as worshipping with psalmody: "And after these things I heard a great voice of much people in heaven saying, Alleluia! salvation, and glory, and honour, and power unto the Lord our God; and I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunderings, saying, Alleluia! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth."

Thus then holy songs are stamped with the character of divine worship in both God's covenants. There is the same principle throughout—human voices, with the voices of musical instruments conjoined, are to be used in prayer and praise. We trace it in the song of Moses and of Miriam; we trace it more systematically in the harp of David; we trace it still more as a regular ordinance in the choirs of Solomon, and then following it onwards in the Gospel, we hear the heavenly angels themselves testifying to the will of God in the Hallelujahs of eternity. But we must now go forward to the Church of Christ. How do we find this custom of choral music to have been practised in the early ages of Christianity? We have abundant and decisive proof from the very earliest times that the chanting of psalms and hymns, with creeds and prayers, was the universal custom of the Church. It was most likely, as other matters, derived from the Jewish custom already prevailing. But certainly, from whatsoever source derived, the proof of its existence is most clear.

The consideration of the choral service of the Church will divide itself, strictly speaking, into two parts; the first, that which relates to the prayers and other portions of a precatory character, and the second, that which relates more especially to psalmody. The whole character of the

service appears to have been that of singing, or more properly speaking, recitative—every thing being said, as said to God, in a solemn and prepared manner, with no idea of producing impression on the people as an audience, but of gathering their minds and voices together in speaking to One of great and wonderful terror and majesty. The voice of prayer was the voice of a monotone—a prolonged, supplicating, earnestly-crying voice, which was not exactly a *chant*, but something between a chant and reading. It was generally denominated the "*canto fermo*" or "*planus cantus*"—in English, plain song or plain tune.* Then with

* Dr. Bisse, in his "Rationale of Cathedral Worship," fully proves both the antiquity and the propriety of chanting the prayers, and he defines the chant, as applied to prayers, to be the "*planus cantus*." "This manner," he says, "gives still an higher dignity, solemnity, and a kind or degree of sanctity to divine worship, by separating it more from all actions and interlocutions that are common and familiar, —chanting being a degree and advance in dignity above the distinct reading or saying used in the church, as that is above the manner of reading or speaking which passes in common conversation and intercourse among men. Chanting the service is found more efficacious to awaken the attention, to stir up the affections, and to edify the understsnding, than plain reading of it.....The voice may be much more raised, extended or exerted in chanting, than is practicable in reading.—Yet some, through unskilfulness in elocution, borrow a corrupt imitation of this manner to strengthen their utterance in their assemblies, and assume a tone in their praying and preaching, not considering that in chanting, though this be natural and pleases, yet in speaking it becomes affected, and offends; and that chanting misunderstood and misapplied falls under the appellation and censure of canting." He then refers to the rubric in king Edward's book, which directs thus: "That in the places where they do sing (or choirs), there shall the Lessons be sung in a plain tune, after the manner of distinct reading, and likewise the Epistle and Gospel"; "whence I observe that, according to the intention of our Church, the manner of chanting should be reduced and regulated to the ancient *planus cantus*, which, as interpreted by that rubric, is, 'after the manner of distinct reading.' And though there may be allowed a greater liberty in chanting the prayers than the lessons, yet there too the injunctions of Elizabeth 49 direct 'that there be a modest and distinct song so used through all the parts of the Common Prayer, that the same may be as plainly understood as if it were read without singing.'—The restitution and continuance of this manner of chanting, which was directed by S. Athanasius even in the Psalms, has been the desire of the judicious, as it was of S. Austin at least in the prayers: 'Qui tam modico flexu vocis faciebat sonare Lectorem Psalmi, pronuncianti

regard to psalmody, we must not understand it to mean anything like the metrical versions of the psalms now in use among us, for the ancients had none of those regular tunes which now prevail, and which require, from their construction, metrical versification ; they had nothing but a solemn and continuous strain of the deepest character, and the psalmody which they used was merely singing the Psalms of David, as found in the Bible itself, with hymns and canticles of a similar character. We find, according to Bingham, that there were four different ways of conducting the public psalmody of the Church. Sometimes the psalms were sung by a single person, the rest of the congregation merely giving their attention. Sometimes they were sung by the whole congregation together. Sometimes again the congregation was divided into two separate choirs, one side repeating one verse, and the other side answering and repeating another verse. Sometimes again one person repeated the beginning of the psalm by himself, and then at a certain point the rest of the choir would join in and conclude the whole. Of these four methods the second and the third seem most generally to have prevailed. The common conjunction of voices was called symphony; and the other, from its division into two sides, with answer, was called antiphony ; and by degrees there grew up, both in the Eastern and Western churches, a mixture of these two methods, and the general

vicinior esset, quam canenti.'" Finally, he sums up the uses of chanting thus: "1. An emblem of *delight*. 2. Of the cheerfulness of our Christian profession. 3. As giving to Divine worship a greater dignity. And 4. A greater power and efficacy to edification."—*Bisse, Rationale of Cathedral Service*, p. 33.

Bingham also describes this "plain song", as being the ancient method of saying the prayers, distinct from the chant:

"As to the voice or pronunciation used in singing, it was of two sorts,—the plain song, and the more artificial and elaborate tuning of the voice to greater variety of sounds and measures. The plain song was only with a little gentle inflexion and agreeable turn of the voice with a proper accent, not much different from reading, and much resembling the musical way of reading the Psalms now in our cathedral churches. This was the way of singing at Alexandria in the time of Athanasius."—*Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church*, book xiv, c. 11, § 15.

character of psalmody resolved itself into the antiphonal chant, which has been brought down to the present day. S. Ignatius was a disciple of S. Peter, and bishop of Antioch; he was contemporary also with S. John; and so early even as this period (the latter part of the first century, or, at any rate, the commencement of the second) did this apostolic father first introduce the system of Church chanting. It is said that he owed his adoption of it to a heavenly vision, in which he heard the angels singing hymns to God: and of this Hooker says—"What matter if Ignatius did at any time hear the angels praising God after this sort or no? If Ignatius did not, yet one who must be with us of greater authority did—'I saw the Lord,' saith the prophet Isaiah, 'on a high throne, the seraphim stood upon it, and one cried to another, saying, Holy, holy, holy Lord God of Hosts, the whole world is full of his glory.'" From Antioch, and Ignatius its bishop, the chant was soon communicated to other places, and we find it in the year 370 at Cæsarea, under S. Basil. Afterwards we find S. Chrysostom speaking of it at Constantinople, and it seems to have prevailed among all the Eastern Churches. From the east it quickly spread into the west, for nearly contemporary with S. Chrysostom we find S. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, sanctioning and using it; and the chanting introduced by that bishop is frequently spoken of in the Confessions of S. Augustine. In one remarkable passage he speaks thus: "At other times, shunning over anxiously this very deception, I err in too great strictness, and sometimes in that degree as to wish the whole melody of sweet music, which is used in David's psalter, banished from my ears and the Church's too; and that mode seems to me the safer, which I remember to have been often told me of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, who made the reader of the psalm utter it with so slight an inflection of voice, that it was nearer speaking than singing. Yet again, when I remember the tears I shed at the psalmody of thy church in the beginning of my recovered faith, and how at this time I am moved, not with the singing, but with the things sung, when they are sung

with a clear voice and modulation suitable, I acknowledge the great use of this institution."*

From Milan and S. Ambrose we trace the chant onwards to Gregory the Great at Rome.† This would be about the end of the sixth century. Upon the basis of the Ambrosian chant, which consisted of four intonations, S. Gregory formed his own improvements, so as to make eight intonations. The Gregorian chants still remain, though now 1200 years old. The grandeur, dignity, and majestic simplicity of their music, so well expressing the feeling of the prophet David, are acknowledged and admired by all. From this Gregory, S. Augustin coming to the unconverted Saxons, became the first archbishop of Canterbury. The mode of his coming is described by venerable Bede: "He came *chanting litanies*, and besought the Lord for the everlasting weal, as well of themselves, as of those for whose sake he had come."..... And "when they drew near that city" (the historian is describing the entry of Augustine and his monks into the city of Canterbury, where first he preached the Christian faith to the Saxons), "and when they drew near to the city, they chanted with one accord the litany in the words following:—'We beseech thee, O Lord, to turn away the fury of thy wrath from all thy people, and chiefly from this city, for we have sinned. Glory be to thee.'"

From the foundation of the see of Canterbury choirs gradually grew up in every quarter of England. With bishoprics there came cathedrals, and with cathedrals

* Aug. Confess. book x, § 50.

† Gregory must indeed have been, as he is called, "the Great,"—one of the most able, as well as the most zealous, of the bishops of Rome. Certainly we owe much to him in England, not only in the conversion from heathenism of the southern parts of our island, but also in our Book of Common Prayer, and in our choral service. Much of our litany is derived from him, and many of our collects have been preserved through, if not derived from, his sacramentary. But in music we certainly owe everything to him; for, according to Bede, there was not any custom of singing before the time of Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, except in Kent; but in *Kent*, by the exertions of Augustin, there had been founded music schools and regular choirs. Gregory is said, when confined by illness, to have taught his choristers even from his bed.

choirs of singers, who, after the Gregorian mode, performed the service of God with musical intonation. From the cathedrals we trace it to college chapels and the private chapels of the bishops and the nobility, many of whom, in the times of devotion, maintained private choirs of their own, carefully observing the Church's services with such diligence and cost as now would astonish those whose only care is for their own grandeur and their own luxury.* When, however, we attribute the introduction of the choral system into England to S. Augustin, we do not mean to allege that the ancient British Churches had been without it. On the contrary, it is a strong proof that the custom is not Roman only, but strictly Catholic, and one appertaining to the whole Church wheresoever she made her way, that antecedently to Augustin, the choral service was used in the British Churches. In the fourth lecture, we endeavoured to show the antiquity of the British Churches, and their probable derivation from an oriental origin. If so, the chants and music of those churches might have been handed down, with other marks of their ritual, from S. Ignatius and S. John.† But be this

* That which is now spent by our nobility in what is but too often a useless squandering upon selfish display, was wont, by their progenitors, in times of old, to be spent in the service of God. In their chapels was very frequently maintained for the service of God a regular choir, at considerable expense. At Cannons, the seat of the Duke of Chandos, Handel was the organist. Lord Mornington, so late as the last century, had a full choir in his chapel in Meath. The bishops also, as would seem so necessary to their holy office, had regular choral establishments. It is said of archbishop Williams, when bishop of Lincoln: "At Buckden, in his chapel, the holy service of God was well ordered and served at noon and evening, with music and organs, as exquisitely as in the best cathedrals, and with such voices as the kingdom afforded not better for skill and sweetness, the bishop himself bearing the tenor part among them often."—See Mr. Jebb's *Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland*, wherein is much very valuable matter on this subject. The author speaks of the Royal chapels, as well as those of the nobility, as having fallen into great decay.

† It is very clear, from many circumstances, that the Welsh have been from time immemorial a musical people. The harp, their national instrument, would by its very construction lead them to something like the counterpoint. The ten fingers of both hands would more easily strike a third, a fifth, or a chord, than a single

as it may, when the British churches became, as afterwards they did, incorporated with the Saxon, the Roman use of Gregory, coupled indeed with some few additions from the east, gradually prevailed, and so the choral service was handed down from age to age, as a constituent part of the discipline of our Church, to the times of the Reformation. It is wonderful to think how in those times of abolishing much that was wrong, yet also of destroying so much that was beautiful, the ecclesiastical chant was, as a system, faithfully retained. But it happened that Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Elizabeth,—the three sovereigns in whose reigns the great purification of the Church took place—were all fond of Church music. Edward VI, and probably the other children of Henry VIII, were specially instructed in music by Christopher Tye, organist of the chapel-royal; and to this circumstance it may no doubt be attributed that, when in so many other points the Genevan and other ultra-Protestant feelings against the Church prevailed, they did not prevail in this matter: on the contrary, at this very period, in Tye, Tallis, Gibbons,

note; and so we find from Giraldus Cambrensis this description:—"In their musical concerts, they do not sing in unison like the inhabitants of other countries, but in many separate parts." See, for this remark, Williams' *Cymry*, cap. xix. This musical talent, we also learn from the same author, was principally dedicated to the service of God; and frequent mention is made, in their ancient writers, of their chants and musical songs:

"The Creed and the Lord's Prayer seem to have occupied a prominent position in the Welsh liturgy. It was a usual saying of Beuno:

'Chant thy Pater Noster, and thy Creed.'

"So an early bard:

'I enquired of all the Priests
The Bishops and Judges
What is most profitable for the soul.
Food [for the needy], the Pater Noster and the Blessed Creed.
Whoever will chant these for his soul
Until the Judgment, will do the very best thing.'

"And in another poem the writer says:

'Thou didst not chant thy Pater Noster
Either at *Matins* or *Vespers*.'"

Williams, Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymry, ch. xvii.

So that we here find chanting at *Matins* and *Vespers*, as the common Welsh custom.

Creyghton, Purcell, and other masters, we behold the ancient spirit of Church music revived, and continuing its sway in the choral services. So much was this the case, and so decidedly did the love of music prevail in the beginning of the Reformation, that in the first liturgy of Edward VI, even the *Lessons* are directed to be said in "*plain tune.*" This indeed was afterwards abandoned, but every other portion of the service in the second book of Edward continued to be used with the chant, and the same practice is followed up in all the subsequent arrangements of the Prayer-Book, even to this day.

But has all this continued without objection? Did the use of the choral service escape the puritanic hostility which put aside for a time the very Church herself, destroyed the throne, and martyred our king? Far from it. Along with the surplice and the ornaments of ministers,—the stained glass, altars, and fonts, the ornaments of churches—fell also the organ and the choir, the instruments and ornaments of psalmody. "Singing and trowling of psalms from one side of the choir to the other, chanting choristers in white surplices, piping organs," were in such language proclaimed to be abominations to the puritanic faction, who loudly cried out for their destruction. Partially, indeed, those opponents prevailed, but, blessed be God, not wholly. To them and to their obstinate refusal to abide by the Church, we may attribute the introduction of metrical psalms, and the so general abolition of anthems. To them also may be attributed the cessation of the "plain tune" or ecclesiastical method of saying the prayers, and the substitution of the declamatory style of *preaching the prayers*, so much even still in vogue. To them also we may attribute the abandonment of every portion of the choral character in the highest service of our Church—the Holy Communion—even in our cathedrals. But still, in spite of these many drawbacks, we have reason greatly to be thankful, that so much that is valuable even in practice, and much more in theory, has been faithfully retained. We cannot do better than remember the beautiful defence of Hooker against the puritanic faction. First he speaks on the principle of joining the

psalms to music (not metrical psalms remember, but the *very* psalms of David). He says, "Touching musical harmony, whether by instrument or by voice, it being but of high and low in sounds a due proportionable disposition, such notwithstanding is the force thereof, and so pleasing effects it hath in that very part of man which is most divine, that some have been thereby induced to think that the soul itself by nature is, or hath in it harmony—a thing which delighteth all ages, and beseemeth all states—a thing as seasonable in grief as in joy—as decent being added unto actions of greatest weight and solemnity, as being used when men most sequester themselves from action".....And then he continues, "The prophet David having therefore singular knowledge, not in poetry alone, but in music also, judged them both to be things most necessary for the house of God, left behind him to that purpose a number of divinely indited poems, and was further the author of adding unto poetry melody in public prayer, melody both vocal and instrumental, for the raising up of men's hearts and the sweetening of their affections towards God." Then he quotes from S. Basil this beautiful passage:—"Whereas the Holy Spirit saw that mankind is unto virtue hardly drawn, and that righteousness is the least accounted of by reason of the proneness of our affections to that which delighteth, it pleased the wisdom of the same Spirit to borrow from melody that pleasure which, mingled with heavenly mysteries, causeth the smoothness and softness of that which toucheth the ear, to convey, as it were by stealth, the treasure of good things into man's mind. To this purpose were those harmonious tunes of psalms devised for us, that they which are in years but young, or touching perfection of virtue as yet not grown to ripeness, might, when they think they sing, learn. O the wise conceit of that heavenly teacher, which hath by His skill found out a way, that doing those things wherein we delight, we may also learn that whereby we profit."

But I must now pass on to the Service Book of our own Church, and endeavour to lay before you those parts of it in which its choral or musical character is principally developed.

First, let us consider the titles of the ordinary daily service, "Matins" and "Even-song." The very title Even-*song* betrays, at the first glance, the choral character which it is meant to sustain. Following the order of the service, we shall observe the rubrics which continually allude to "singing," and sometimes to "saying," but hardly ever mention the word "reading." Thus we open with the voice of psalmody :—"Then shall be said or *sung*"; and the psalm follows :—"O come let us *sing* unto the Lord." Next to this we may observe the portion of the psalms of David appointed for the day; the hymns after each lesson ; the Apostles' or Athanasian Creed; the anthem after the third collect. And in addition to these places in which it is specially directed by the rubric, the custom of cathedrals points out the general Church usage of chanting (either with or without the organ), the various suffrages and responses which occur throughout : as, for instance, the first one, which calls forth the voice of praise :—"O Lord, open thou our lips"; and the response : —"And our mouth shall shew forth thy praise." These suffrages and responses as set to music with the organ, are, however, generally reserved for the greater festivals, thereby marking those days by a higher and more exhilarating character of devotion.

In the Litany, which stands third in the order of our Church services, it has always been the practice of *all* Churches, both the east and west, both unreformed and reformed, to use the chant. However the feelings of persons as individuals may be averse to the chant of the litany, yet beyond question there is no portion of the service so universally chanted as this. At the consecration of Archbishop Parker,—a special act of the Reformation, since he was the first archbishop of the reformed Church of England—it is said, that "the bishop elect of Chichester, having exhorted the people to prayer, betook himself to sing the litany, the choir answering." At the coronation of George III, the litany was chanted by two bishops, the choir making the responses with the organ. But usage can do no more for us in this matter than the words of direction which are placed before us. Observe the rubric :—

"Here followeth the litany or general supplication to be SUNG or said."

From the litany let us pass on to the fourth service—that of the Holy Communion. This service is most assuredly of a highly joyful character, and peculiarly adapted to music; for it is called by a name which no other part of the Prayer Book bears—the *Eucharist*, which signifies *giving thanks*. The parts of the communion service which are commanded by the rubrics to be sung (of course where there is a *choir*, so that they can be fitly sung) are these:—First, the *Nicene Creed*, then the hymn *Ter Sanctus*, which begins "Holy, holy, holy Lord God of hosts", immediately before the consecration of the elements, and lastly, the hymn *Gloria in excelsis*, or, "Glory be to God on high", which occurs at the close of the service. But in addition to these, which are rubrical commands, the cathedral practice has added the responses in the decalogue, which are a sort of antiphon or anthem repeated in the interval of each commandment; also the insertion of a hymn—"*Glory be to thee, O Lord*"—before the Gospel, and lastly, what is called the "*Sursum Corda*", that is, the suffrages with their response beginning "Lift up your hearts", "We lift them up unto the Lord." These, together with the *Amens*, are the only parts in the communion service, in which either custom or rubrical direction sanctions a musical accompaniment—not many in themselves, but still sufficient to add great solemnity and beauty to the service, when rightly and devoutly performed.*

Now every one will readily agree, that there is quite sufficient here to justify me in saying that the desire of our Church is that her services should be of a choral cha-

* A great deal of the use of our Prayer Book must depend upon that of Edward VI, from which it has been altered in several respects at different periods of our history (see Lecture III); but particularly in regard to the different portions which are commanded to be sung. The Antiphon or Anthem, sung now by common tradition before the gospel, is thus derived from the Prayer Book of 1549:

"One appointed to read the Gospel shall say—The Holy Gospel written in the ——— chapter of ——— &c.

"The clerks and people shall answer—'*Glory be to thee, O Lord.*'"

racter—that they should be performed by a choir or chorus of singers; not intending that the choir should take the duty of the people, but simply that there should be a certain number of persons skilled in music to *lead* the congregation. The Church ever contemplates her people as taking their portion, and a very large portion it is, of the duty of public service; she does not consider the congre-

Now this rubric is omitted, but the *custom* remains. This may serve as an example for many usages of a like kind still remaining among us.

I will mention some further places where singing is directed in Edward VI's first book.

1. In the first place, *The Nicene Creed*, thus:

After the Gospel ended, the priest shall begin—"I believe in one God."

The clerks shall sing the rest.

2. *The Offertory.*—Then shall follow for the Offertory one or more of these sentences of Holy Scripture, *to be sung* while the people do offer.

Again,—"Where there be clerks, they shall *sing* one or many of the sentences above written."

And again—"In the meantime while the clerks *do sing* the offertory."

3. *The Hymn Ter Sanctus.*—When the clerks have done *singing*, then shall the priest or deacon turn him to the people, &c.

4. *The Prayer for Church Militant.*—Then the priest turning himself to the altar shall say or *sing*:

5. After, and during the distribution of the sacrament, sentences of Scripture were ordered to be sung thus:

"In the communion time the clerks shall *sing*, O Lamb of God," &c.

We have moreover in our own Prayer Book, as it is at present used, many other places where singing is introduced, more particularly in the marriage service.

The Psalm—"Then the minister or clerks going to the Lord's table shall say or *sing* this psalm following:"

And in the service for the burial of the dead thus:

1. The priest and clerks meeting the corpse at the entrance of the churchyard, and going before it, shall say or *sing*:

"I am the resurrection," &c.

2. When they come to the grave, the priest shall say, or the priest and clerks shall *sing*:

"Man that is born of a woman," &c.

3. Then shall be said or *sung*:

"I heard a voice from heaven," &c.

All this, well considered by any candid person, will clearly show the general choral character intended to be fixed upon our Prayer Book, not only in the common services, but throughout the occasional services as well.

gation as mere lookers on, as in the Church of Rome, but she considers them as a people with *voices*; as a people rejoicing in psalmody,—a people with hearts to feel and voices to give forth the praises of their God with melody. The only place where the people are not required to join, is in the anthem after the third collect. There it may sometimes happen that a higher degree of musical skill is required than is possessed by the majority of persons, but even there, if simple and well-chosen choral anthems were appointed, the people might take their part; and certainly where metrical psalms are used by way of anthem, there every one can join both with facility and effect. What we require, indeed, is this—a greater attention, in the education of our children, to *ecclesiastical music*. All the higher orders, and even the middle classes, dedicate a certain portion of their education to music, but it is not the music of the Church. That which we should imagine to be, as it was in the case of David and Solomon, the first and chiefest part of music—*the music of the service of God*—is comparatively neglected in education; and while much time is consumed, and great displays are attempted in all sorts of *profane* music, the very persons most eminent, and best qualified by such education to take their part in choral worship, sit down in the house of God, as though it were far beneath them to sing in the service of Him who died to save them. Now, if some little attention to the chants and services of the Church were but given by our higher orders as a matter of duty, and if they would bring their books into church, with voices as well as minds ready to sing God's praise, what a service would ours be. There would be nothing like it in dignity and devotion under heaven; far superior would it be to that of the Church of Rome, with all its boast; for there the music is for *display*, it has the character of the opera or theatre: with us it is meant to be solely for *religion*.

But now it will be said by many, "All this may be very true in theory,—rubrics may direct certain portions of the Prayer Book to be sung, and the practice of cathedrals may sanction it; but still, I cannot see its propriety. It seems

to me so perfectly *unnatural tó sing a prayer*. I cannot even endure the chant when applied to the Psalms, much less when applied to the prayers, or litany, or creeds." Such we know is the general language of ordinary people when speaking of the choral service. Now I am fully prepared to join issue with such objectors, and to reply, that if the singing of prayers be unnatural, the *reading* of prayers is much more unnatural. When, however, the phrase is used, "to sing a prayer", it is not quite correct. for the real meaning of a *song*, as we generally understand it, is such a succession of sounds as shall fall or rise from one note to another at varying intervals; but the choral or cathedral way of saying the prayers is not such, nor was ever meant to be such; it is merely the sustaining of one note, or monotone, throughout the prayer, with a slight modulation at the end. Now an earnest, solemn, eager way of asking a great gift, is much more consonant with this one tone, than what is called "*reading the prayers so as to be impressive*." Let us consider *for whom* the prayer is made, *to whom* the prayer is made, and what is the *subject* of the prayer. The priest or minister utters a voice *for the people*,—for their welfare, their help, their salvation. He does not intend (or he ought not) *to preach any doctrine*, by means of the prayer. He does not desire (at least he ought not) to impress the congregation with any notion of the beauty of his elocution, or the suavity of his voice. He does not desire (or ought not) to affect their feelings, or convince their understanding, or strengthen their faith. None of these are the objects of prayer. If they were, then indeed, impressiveness of manner, and variety of tone, as in a preacher, would be things desirable: but it is not so. The simple object is to PRAY—to *ask* something; it is the voice of entreaty, of begging, of urging with importunity, and that daily, before the throne of God, the wants, weaknesses, and sins of men. He who is of a sudden cast into some urgent danger, does not supplicate his brother who stands by, to deliver him from his danger by striving to be *impressive*, but his voice is raised in the peril of the instant with a sustained note or lengthened cry of anguish or pain. Herein, therefore, in

the service of our Prayer Book, lies the essential difference between the exhortations, addresses, or sermons, made *to the people*, and the prayers, psalms, or thanksgivings, *made to God*. The beauty of the one part may certainly be its impressiveness, whereas the beauty of the other is its want of impressiveness. The end of the one is to warn, exhort, or teach *men;* the end of the other is to gain something, or to represent some want, or to obtain deliverance from some evil, at the hands of *God*. While, therefore, in the one an impassioned and eloquent tone of voice may rightly be used,—in the other, a solemn, equable, unisonous voice is demanded. It has been well said, that nothing marks so much the difference between Dissenters and Catholics, as the way in which public prayer is offered by their respective ministers. It seems as though in the self-will and self-seeking of the Dissenter, even his prayers lose the end to which they should be looking, and verge towards the applause of men: while in the Catholic, his whole mind being intent and wrapped up in the Person to whom his prayer is uttered, his very voice is affected in unison; ordinary speech and ordinary sounds are carefully eschewed; he speaks in the plaintive, unobtrusive tone which the chant so peculiarly describes; and though there is no regard to effect, still the consequence is, that,—the congregation being undisturbed by extraneous matter, there arises a legitimate, hearty, and mental union with him in the voice of supplication.

But again: suppose we set aside all question regarding prayer, still there are objectors to the choral service being used to the Psalms. All that many would allow in divine service to be performed with music or singing would be the metrical psalms, or some arrangement of hymns of a similar character. Now in regard to the metrical psalms, it should be well understood that they do not form a regular and component part of our service. They are only *permitted* to be sung, not commanded. The custom of singing metrical psalms was first introduced in the reign of Elizabeth, having been brought to England by those who had suffered exile in the reign of Mary, and who had learnt this custom in the Low Countries. If we examine

the title which is prefixed to these psalms, we shall find that they were intended by their compilers to be sung as moral and religious songs in private houses, rather than in the public services ; and if in churches at all, then before or after sermons, rather than in the service itself. In some places, it is customary at the present day, for the country people to assemble in the church, and practise the singing of psalms, more as a pastime than anything else, before the service has begun. But to these psalms many people would entirely confine church singing, exclaiming that all else is wrong. Their argument generally turns on one or other of these points ; either all else is *unnecessary*, or it is *popish*, or it makes the service *too long*, or perhaps, without giving any reason, they simply say they *do not like it*. Let us examine these points.

1. As to anything being done in Church service solely with a view to its *necessity;* if we once admit that argument, the whole liturgy itself would very quickly be set aside. It would be very difficult to say at what point there is a *necessity* even to pray publicly, or hear Scripture or sermons ; and certainly no one could say that all the particular forms of our service book, either in their extent or their number, are *necessary*. But surely a religious man will not measure his service to God by such a cold calculation as this. As our Almighty Father supplies *us* with blessings beyond the bounds of bare necessity, so should we in return do more than render back His praise by the plummet and the line. I know of no greater hinderer of devotion than a calculating utilitarian. He cuts off the course and stream of every religious feeling at its very fountain. There is no arguing with him, for his tones of thought and feeling are out of the reach of argument. He walks by sight ; and as religion does not walk by sight but by faith, he can have nothing in common with her. As indeed the sounds of gladness in choral song are not to be proved as *necessary*,—as the voices of the tuneful birds are not to be proved as *necessary*,—as the beauty of colours in the light and airy wings of the insect tribe are not, in his sense, *necessary*,—so would all be with him equally set aside, and nature be reduced to

the barren coldness of his own hard and immovable heart. "They must have hearts very dry and tough", says Hooker, "from whom the melody of the Psalms doth not sometime draw that wherein a mind religiously affected delighteth."

II. Next, as to the *popish tendency* of the choral service:—The same arguments which have answered this objection when urged against other points of our Church observance, will answer it also here. Errors and abuses there may no doubt have been in the adaptation of music to the Church. The hiring of singers and persons attached to the theatre for the sake of public display;—the introduction of light and theatrical airs in the place of the ancient solemn music of the Church—the bestowing attention upon mere sounds, which move the senses in trifling and wanton amusement, instead of moving the affections by solemn and dignified appeals to devotion;—all these are errors frequently observed upon by the Fathers of the Church from the very earliest times—errors which every one will see to attach naturally to the subject, but no more to be brought against *the system* of the choral service, than the prayer of the Pharisee, who prayed to be seen of men in the streets, is to be brought against the system of prayer. S. Jerome says, "Let young men hear this, let those hear it who have the office of singing in the Church, that they sing, not with their voice, but with their *heart*, to the Lord,—not like tragedians physically preparing their throat and mouth that they may sing after the fashion of the theatre in the Church. He that has but an ill voice, if he has good works, is a sweet singer before God." Again, in regard to the congregation, if they remain silent and take no part,—if they come merely to have the ear gratified, and not to pray as in devotional service, that fault of *theirs* is not to be visited on the Church system. The Church system is not to fall into desuetude, because, in the Church of Rome, it has happened that the musical service, by reason of its exceedingly ornate and theatrical character, has attracted a crowd of mere idle listeners. On the contrary, the fault is to be mended in the congregation, by their learning and attending to the requirements which the Church makes of

them, that they join, every one, in the voice of her chaste and ancient psalmody. The Church of England has ever been mindful of the danger of such an attraction in her music, as would affect the ear and not the heart. She would gladly affect the heart *by* the ear, but is fearful of affecting the ear only. She has remembered the words of S. Jerome again, "Let the servant of Christ so order his singing, that the words that are read may please more than the voice of the singer."* S. Augustine, too, carefully estimates this danger and balances the good against the abuse. He says, "I fluctuate between peril of pleasure and approved wholesomeness, inclined the rather to approve the usage of singing in the Church, that so, by the delight of the ears, the weaker minds may rise to the feeling of devotion; yet when it befalls me to be more moved with the voice than with the words sung, I confess to have sinned penally, and then had rather not hear music."† "But yet," he says, as before quoted, "I acknowledge the great use of this institution." Aware, then, of the *possible* abuses, let us guard against them; but at the same time aware of the continual beauties and blessings, let us cherish them,—not so much fearing the name of Popery, but looking to the thing itself, and judging it by itself.

III. Next, if we take the argument of the objector as to the choral service making our time in church *too long*. Let us cheerfully assent that our services *are* too long,—that their unity is spoiled and their beauty marred by our present custom of remaining sometimes three, sometimes four hours without any cessation or rest in prayer and preaching. It is so; but then this fault is not to be visited upon the Church system, but upon the destroyers of the Church system. Our present habit is to join those which are meant to be three distinct services into one. We join matins, litany, and communion together, all which might be separate; or, at any rate, one might be separate from the other two. The matins service, which is meant to be performed early in the morning, we will not attend, because of our idle and indulgent habits. We turn night

* Hieronym. in Ephes. v. † Augustin, Conf. lib. x, § 50.

into day, and never know what the morning and the sunrise is, and then we force the matins into a junction with the communion, so that we may, as it were, have it all over at once and get rid of it ; and then, having so done, we complain if the clergy desire to perform these services, as the Church would have them, chorally, *because of their length.* Now it is obvious that we should remedy this evil in the right way, that is, by restoring the services to their proper places. First, let the matins service be performed early in the morning. It would occupy, chorally performed, one hour at the most. Then let the litany and communion service be performed at noon, and these would occupy, with a sermon, about an hour and a half. In this way we should really enjoy the services provided for us, and enter into them with a zeal, a freshness, and a delight, to which the bulk of our people are now, I fear, strangers.

In the first place, we wear out the bodies and minds of our clergy by the severity of the calls thus made upon them ; in the next place, we destroy our own devotion as a congregation, and involve ourselves in every sort of contradiction and absurdity. For instance, we thank God in one of the collects for " bringing us safely to the *beginning* of the day," when the sun has attained its meridian ; and then, guilty of all this contradiction of common sense, we find fault with that great and singular beauty of our Prayer Book—the choral service, the full restoration of which would alone give us alacrity, zeal, cheerfulness and delight in our devotions.

IV. Yet one more objection and we have done. Answer all as you may : let it be granted that the choral service is not to be rejected as being *unnatural ;* nor as being *unnecessary ;* nor as being *popish ;* nor as being *too long ;* yet, after all, we shall have another objection urged upon us, which is perhaps the real one contained in all the rest : " *I do not like it*": that is to say, prejudice,—the indescribable prejudice of habit, of personal, individual feeling is against it. With this there is of course no argument to be used ; we can merely express a strong deprecation of it, as being totally unworthy of any one who confesses

himself to be a member of Christ's holy Catholic Church. There are three rulers and guides of our habits and actions—two of them false guides, the third alone faithful—public opinion, private judgment, and the Church. Some men are entirely guided, even in their very thoughts, by what is called public opinion. A public newspaper, for instance, bringing all its force and power to bear on any question of Church observance, will guide a very large class of the community, and, without considering the very little probability there is that an editor of a newspaper should know very much of the Church or of divinity, weak-minded men are very soon led in alarm to shape their views to any form that this "organ of public opinion" may direct. A very little thought would show them that, after all, the editor of such a newspaper is but one single individual. Or public opinion may again be expressed in the word *fashion*;—what every body says must be right;—to resist, alone, the observations and assertions of *the world*,—sometimes its ridicule, sometimes its falsehoods—is a hard matter, except to one well-trained in the school of discipline;—but there are few such. The consequence is, that with this great class of men,—men without thought, without reading, without stability, without self-discipline, all argument is disposed of by the expression, "*I do not like it*". Some, on the contrary, will have a mind of their own;—listening to nothing which is said either one way or the other, but chalking out their own plans, and considering every question by the little light that is within their own intellects, they will neither believe, nor acknowledge any thing to be right but what may be brought within their own comprehension. Such has ever been the principle of dissent, and such has ever been the moving power leading to the sins of schism and heresy. Speak, then, to these about the choral service of our Church, as being founded on an abstract theory of perfection; or speak of the philosophy of its devotion, or its tendency to create or promote religious feelings; or speak to them of its universal practice in the Church in all ages,—of the concurrent testimony of the east and west, of the Fathers, of good and learned bishops,

of righteous and faithful saints,—of what avail will all this be? It will all be answered by the little independent light within, which burns in never-ceasing self-complacency, and gives itself forth in the unanswerable words, "*I do not like it*".

But, my brethren, do, I beseech you, suffer yourselves honestly to learn that the truth of a question neither depends on private judgment nor on public opinion; but that in questions affecting our faith, or our Church's practices, the sole tribunal under God's Holy Spirit to which we must appeal is, THE CHURCH. It is not by the world, —understanding by that word "the *fashion* of the world, which passeth away":—it is not by the world; nor is it by our own little prejudices fostered within, and arising out of wrong habits unchecked and misdirected,—it is not by these guides that we are to judge of right and wrong in religion. To the Church has been promised by our Lord the possession of the keys of the kingdom of heaven,—the power, by His imparting in the Holy Spirit, to discern and to decree, even in matters of faith, much more in matters of ceremony, what is good, andfitting, and true. Now the Church universal,—from S. John the divine and S. Ignatius down to the present day—in the east and in the west —in its reformed branches * and in the unreformed—in

* We may be surprised to learn that the *Reformed* Churches, that is to say, the *Lutheran*, should have equally retained the chant with ourselves. If any, we should have expected that the German Churches, from their ultra Protestantism, would have abolished it; but not so. So universal, so without exception throughout Christendom was the ecclesiastical chant, that nowhere do we find it absent, except in the mere modern offshoots of dissent of these latter days.

Mr. Jebb, in his work above quoted, has a note to the following effect (section xxiii, p. 166):

"Burney, in his History of Music (vol. iii, p. 33), says that the ancient ecclesiastical tones still regulated the music of the Lutheran Church at the time of the Reformation. He refers to one of their 'Kirchenordenungs', or liturgies, for the Reformed Church, printed at Basle in 1565, and another at Luneburg in 1621. The author has examined several of these, particularly one printed at Wittenburg in 1554, and another at Luneburg, 1643. The music is set to the collects, creeds, preface, versicles, canons, &c. in German as well as in Latin."

How any charge of popery can attach to chanting after this, it is difficult to conceive.

the Greek as well as the Roman—in the Roman as well as the Anglican—has decreed that the choral mode of performing divine service in honour of God and His Son Jesus Christ, is the right one. Let us, then, as men of reasonable faculties, as well as Christians of an humble faith, banish all such puerile suggestions as may be derived from our own mere private fancies. Let us cast them aside, and if, by any unhappy distortion of our present habits, we do not take delight in that in which the Church has taken delight, let us, by a stedfast submission of our own judgment to that of the Church, *learn* to take delight in it. This is unquestionably our *duty*, and this is unquestionably the mark of a really wise and great mind. Thus only can we be brought, in the worship of God, to any degree of unity, or any degree of faithfulness in devotion, when we each of us learn the Christian discipline of giving up our own likings for the sake of Christ and His Church.

And now finally, let us conclude in the words of the sweet and royal psalmist, the prophet David,—of him who has led the way, and ever will until the world's end keep the highest place as master of the choral songs of our holy Zion. Look to the last of his Psalms. He calls upon the very stones and rocks to sing God's praise. He calls upon the irresponsible beasts and fishes,—he calls upon the waters and the seas, the ice and snow, the clouds and vapours,—as being God's creatures, and of necessity giving forth to Him the praise of an involuntary motion, speaking with their dumb and silent mouths. And shall man be mute? MAN, to whom has been imparted the voice of mind,—whose lips, touched with the hallowed fire of the spirit of the living God, have broken forth with LANGUAGE,—a gift which no other creature of God has, save the holy angels,—shall man alone be silent? Shall he alone be a heedless stranger to the strains of musical praise? Shall he alone, after invoking God to come down from heaven and dwell among us, receive Him, when He comes, with the chill monotony of dumbness and mute apathy?

O, surely not. Stir up the gift that is in you, dearly

beloved brethren. "Praise ye the Lord from the heavens. Praise Him in the height. Praise ye the Lord from the earth, ye dragons and all deeps, mountains and hills, snow and vapours, stormy wind, fulfilling his word. KINGS of the earth, and all PEOPLE, PRINCES, and all JUDGES of the earth, YOUNG MEN and MAIDENS, OLD MEN and CHILDREN, —praise ye the name of the Lord. Let everything that hath breath, praise the Lord."

SERMON XIV.

ANALOGY OF THE PRAYER BOOK WITH HUMAN LIFE.

1 THESSALONIANS v. 17, 18.

"*Pray without ceasing. In everything give thanks.*"

TRUE religion may always be distinguished from false imitations of it, by two characteristic marks,—its gradual advancement, and its universal adaptation. It does not consist in sudden bursts of feeling, or violent transitions from one state into another,—from the depth of sin into a suddenly exalted state of holiness, or from coldness and apathy into a sudden warmth of zeal and fervency; but it begins from a little seed, at first imperceptible, but gradually unfolding itself in growth and fruit as by time it gathers strength, and by experience it reaches unto maturity. There is ever described in Holy Scripture, first a spiritual birth, and then an advancement in growth, as in the parable of the mustard seed, which grows from the smallest of seeds into the largest of trees. Lapses are recorded, then recoveries; times of sickness and weakness, then restored strength and renovated vigour; battles and contests fought, then victory gained; dangers and perils encountered, then security won;—and no thought seems ever to be entertained that the perfection of the Christian course is to be achieved at once, or with a mere volition; but all along is traced a progressive advancement, step by step, through many a scene of peril and vicissitude.

And again, there is in true religion a *universal adaptation* of its principles and its demands. For as it grows from a small beginning and gradually advances, so it runs

by this gradual progress into every portion of the heart and life, and leaves nothing untouched, like the leaven in the parable, which rested not until it had leavened *the whole* of the three measures of meal. Whatever circumstances of life may surround us, for those circumstances true religion will provide ; not, indeed, furnishing a banquet here and leaving a famine there, but at all times affording us gentle and sufficient food; not concentrating its energies and its vitality into some one or two grand events, and in all lesser things dropping down into chillness and apathy, but diffusing all along life's varied course an equal tone of steady and faithful readiness ; not separating our character into any distinction of times or circumstances, so that we may be at one time religious, with permission to relax at another, or be in one respect strict observers of holiness, with liberty to neglect another ; but preserving us every day the same, and in every position of life alike.

But moreover, akin to these two notes of true religion. we may observe another vital truth gathered from Holy Scripture, — namely this, that in order to supply that which is demanded on the part of God, there are continual helps and aids given to man in proportion. If religion is to be progressive, and if religion is to be universal, then for such progression and universality we should look in Holy Scripture for a teaching in accordance therewith. And such is the case. For our *gradual growth*, we have a gradual supply of food, as S. Paul says : "Every one that useth milk is unskilful in the word of righteousness, for he is a *babe*. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of *full age*, even to those who, by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil." Here we have, in the different stages of man's advance in religion, different food, suited to the advances made ; not an indiscriminate pouring forth of the treasures of God's kingdom, but such a supply as may be adequate to the wants of the time ; and this corresponds with many things which Our Saviour Himself says to His Apostles ; for instance, "I have many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them yet." And again : "What I do, thou knowest not

now, but thou shalt know hereafter." The same may be said with respect to the *universality* of the Scripture teaching: we do not find that the Gospel has a message for *one* tone of character, or *one* circumstance of life, or for *one* age, or for *one* class; but while we find for the sinner repentance, and for the sorrowful comfort, we find for the holy blessedness, and for the righteous the peace of God: while we find stimulants and exhortations for times of security, we find comforts and encouragements for times of danger. The rule of Scripture is applicable to all parts of life. It is a universal rule. It has a word of advice and teaching for every class. It is close at hand, ever ready, prompt to be consulted, and to none denied. "It is not hidden from thee, neither is it far off. It is not in heaven that thou shouldst say, Who should go up for us to heaven, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it. Neither is it beyond the sea, that thou shouldst say, Who shall go over the sea for us, and bring it unto us, that we may hear it and do it. But the word is very nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it." And again, we are to "speak of it to our children, when we sit in our houses, and when we walk by the way,—when we lie down, and when we rise up."

Now if such be the notes of true religion, and if Holy Scripture furnishes us with such guides for their attainment, we should expect in every book of devotion which purposed to have the same ends in view, the same principles,—that is to say, we should expect a gradual teaching, and a universal teaching. We should not expect high-wrought and mysterious exhibitions of doctrine, which would of necessity be confined to a very small class of the most faithful; but we should expect two things,—first, the very rudiments and first principles of the religion of Jesus, set forth as for the babes; and then, the strong meat for those of full age. We should not expect, on the one hand, the aged and the mature cared for, and those alone; nor, on the other hand, the young and the inexperienced cared for, and those alone; but we should expect that it would be such a book as would be "*all things to all men*", em-

bracing every one in turn, being ready in every stage of life, and in every condition of man, to have its word of counsel and its word of preparation. And in this expectation, when we come to take up the Book of Common Prayer, we shall not be disappointed ; for one of the first elements of its construction seems to be this very point. There is hardly any age but which shall find in it instruction,—hardly any circumstance of life but shall find in it such services of devotion as shall be suitable and appropriate to the sins and infirmities of man. We trace it on from stage to stage, in parallel lines with human life. At every halting place in the journey, we have nothing to do but to take up this book for our manual of prayer, and herein we shall see the form and manner in which the Church would have us think, would have us pray, would have us act.

I proceed now to point this out, as being the last great principle of our Prayer Book of which it will be necessary to speak,—endeavouring herein to show its parallel and analogy with the life of man.

How beautifully does the Psalmist describe the formation of the human being : "My substance was not hid from thee when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance yet being imperfect, and in thy book were all my members written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them." The productions of nature in all its walks are indeed wonderful. The origin and growth of vegetation, the seeds and fruits of plants reproducing their kind in never-ceasing order ; the generation of the lower animals, even to the minutest insect invisible to the eye, for ever continuing. All these, in number, variety, and fecundity infinite, are indeed objects of our thoughtful wonder. But how much more so the generation of man ; how much more the spread and increase of that being to whom God consigned the dominion over all else which He created : "God blessed them and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it, and have dominion

over the fish of the sea and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." But in the generation of man there is not only the same wonderful fact of birth and growth, as in any one of the other animals,—not only the formation of his being in the womb, and progressive growth from conception to existence,—not only the wonderful fact that his generation has gone on from age to age in such a ratio, that from one have gone forth the many millions and millions which now people the earth,—but there is this great fact in addition, that in the birth of each separate individual of these many millions, along with his animal creation there has been the creation of a soul, as it is called in Scripture, "*a living soul.*" First, we have the earthly elements of man's nature, the dust; and then we have, in order to mark his superiority over all the other creatures, the spiritual elements of his nature, the soul: "In the image of God created He him." "The image of God" is stamped upon man, and upon no other animal, and that image is the moral and intellectual power within him,—not visible, but felt,—not for a day, but advancing onwards and never-dying, conveying to him the immortality of God Himself. Therefore, the birth of every human being involves, not only the birth of a creature, but of a soul,—we have to think not only of the wonderful *mechanism*, if we may so say, of a corporal birth, and of the dangers of life and death which surround it, but we have also to think of the spiritual existence, then first brought to light, either for good or evil, unto eternity. And the more we dwell upon this wonderful subject, the more we shall see the remarkable peculiarities which surround it. We have reason to conclude that if the nature of man had remained without sin, the birth of man would have remained without danger; because we find that the dangers attending a human birth are pronounced by God as the mark of His curse against man for the fall. By Eve's transgression there came upon every woman the inheritance of sin, in these words: "Unto the woman He said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception. In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children." In correspondence with this curse, there

was appointed in the law a ceremonial service, typifying its origin and marking in its character the necessity of restoration to God on the part of every mother after the birth of every child. This ceremony was called the Purification. The woman was kept apart from the congregation for a certain number of days. She then made an offering to God,—a lamb for a burnt offering and a turtle-dove for a sin-offering; and if not able to bring a lamb, by reason of poverty, then two turtle-doves and two young pigeons. And so the Blessed Virgin, Mother of our Lord, carried on this custom from the Law to the Gospel, appearing in the temple "when the days of her purification according to the law of Moses were accomplished";—not that she needed this purification in reality, because the birth of our Blessed Lord was without spot of sin, but only thus by example to show, in her own case, the fulfilment of the universal law of women in CHILD-BIRTH. And such has ever been the custom in the Church of Christ. Carrying on the legal ceremony derived from the curse of Eve, the Church has ever signified that though the Gospel has taken away the curse, still the birth of every child should call to mind the origin of natural impurity in which, without that Gospel, we should stand. And therefore at this point the Prayer Book begins its work. A birth begins with peril of the body as well as peril of the soul: peril of the body to the mother, peril of the soul to the child; and the first office of the Prayer Book, in strict analogy with the doctrine now laid down, presents to us the mother risen from her bed of danger to give thanks unto God for her safety. She comes into His house of prayer, to offer before His throne her acknowledgment of praise and prayer. This service is entitled,

"THE THANKSGIVING OF WOMEN AFTER CHILD-BIRTH, COMMONLY CALLED THE CHURCHING OF WOMEN."*

Thus, then, we commence. But since there are (as just observed) two parties in the dangers of the birth of

* That this service is really derived from the legal ceremony of "purification," we have only to note that the title of the service in king Edward's first book was this: "The Order of the Purification

man; as there is the mother who presents her thanksgiving to God, in token of her past impurity, the inheritance of Eve, so there is the child, partaker of the same impurity, and in his nature the child of sin, the inheritance of Adam. And as for the mother, the Book of Common Prayer presents its form of devotion to cleanse from this impurity in the service of the Gospel; so for the child there is prepared, as the commencement of its spiritual life, a holy mystery in which is conveyed the sacramental washing away of sin and a new birth unto righteousness. Not more than two or three weeks* should pass away before the child is brought to God, in the office of Holy Baptism. We find it in the Prayer Book under this head :—

"THE MINISTRATION OF PUBLIC BAPTISM OF INFANTS TO BE USED IN THE CHURCH."

Though, indeed, the child so brought is *apparently* innocent, and is actually innocent of *sin in deed*, still, as being the heir of Adam's transgression, he has need of the water of regeneration for salvation. Such has ever been the doctrine of the Church. As long as his birth-sin, or original sin, as it is sometimes called, remains upon him, he is in danger. Nothing can effectually get rid of this

of Women." It was changed, in 1552, into that of "The Churching of Women"; and one thing is observable in the old service, that it contemplates the baptism of the child previous to the churching of the mother. In the opening address of the service, the words in the first book are: "Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God of His goodness to give you safe deliverance, *and your child baptism*",—and this agrees with our present rubric in the baptismal service, contemplating the baptism of the child at so early a period that the mother would necessarily be absent: "The curates of every parish shall often admonish the people that they defer not the baptism of their children longer than the first or second Sunday after their birth or other holy day falling between, unless upon great and reasonable cause, to be approved by the curate." And this perhaps accounts for the omission of the word *mother* in the canon which regulates the sponsors in baptism. While the twenty-ninth canon forbids the father from being a sponsor, it does not forbid the mother. The words are these: "No parent shall be urged to be present, nor be admitted to answer as godfather for his own child."

* See the rubric quoted in the preceding note.

danger but that ordinance which our Lord expressly commanded as the way of admission into His Church : "Except ye be born of water and of the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God." By this, the little child brought before the congregation, is admitted a member of the flock ;—he is signed with the sign of the cross, the token of his faith ;—he is sent forth under the pledge of the sponsors, that they will instruct him in the doctrines of the faith, so that he may be ready to hold conflict with "the world, the flesh, and the devil," and to fight as Christ's faithful soldier and servant under the banner of His cross unto his life's end.*

But human life advances, and the babe daily receiving strength and manifesting growth in the members of his body and the workings of his mind, approaches boyhood. As he throws off the lisping accents of the infant, and looks around him, standing in the perils of this miserable world, which he now begins to contemplate and examine for himself ; the Church, still anxious, and in parallel

* I have not noticed that service which is inserted in our Prayer Book for the baptism of adults,—because it does not fall in with the idea pursued in the present lecture,—of the analogy of human life. The baptism of adults, though allowed in our Church, and of course in all cases to be resorted to, where from any neglect or omission it has been passed by in infancy,—still does not make a regular part of its discipline. It can only be resorted to as an exception to the rule; and, indeed, the whole service is only an addition made to the Prayer Book at the last review. See the Preface, which states thus, speaking of the variations from the former book: "..... an office for the baptism of such as are of riper years, which, although not so necessary when the former book was compiled, yet by the growth of Anabaptism, through the licentiousness of the late times crept in among us, is now become necessary, and may be always useful for the baptizing of natives in our plantations, and others converted to the faith."

The errors of the Anabaptists, who rejected infant baptism, made this service necessary, as, in case of their return to the Church, some form would be required, in which the baptismal pledge would be taken by the person baptized in his own person, and not by a sponsor. But however this be, whether baptism take place in the infant or in the adult, still the idea of a birth and growth is equally preserved ; for the spiritual birth or regeneration takes place in both cases alike, and the grown-up person would equally with the infant date his admission into the Church, and his regeneration, from the time of his baptism. The oldest man would be but a babe in Christ, and but new-born by water and the Holy Ghost.

lines with his advancement, keeps watch over him, and prepares her holy lessons of instruction. The child has been new-born; has been made the heir of Christ's kingdom. The sponsors have pledged themselves to bring him up in virtuous and godly living suitable to that inheritance, and to teach him all things which a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health. But how is this to be done? Does the Church leave the sponsors without any guidance in this difficult work? Does she leave them to teach the children of their charge according to their own individual plans and systems of doctrine? No. The Church, by her Book of Common Prayer, still sets before them the way in which she would have her children taught. The child is born, but he may die. He is, indeed, an heir of salvation, but not yet a possessor. As many physical diseases are ready to destroy his body, so many moral diseases are ready to destroy his soul. Much and fatal ignorance will gather upon him if left to himself,—many frightful and unsuspected snares will beset his path,—many and deadly enemies will spring up on the right hand and on the left. This the Church knows, though the child may not, and so she prepares her next service for the spiritual instruction and growth in grace of her faithful little ones. She says to them: "Come with me, and I will take you by the hand and help you; I will point out to you, with your sponsors and parents, the dangers in which you stand, and the way by which you may avoid them,—the enemies by which you are surrounded, and the means of grace by which you may defeat them. Through me you have first come unto Christ, and in baptism have been washed; through me, then, you shall remain in Christ, feeding as babes on the milk of God's holy word." The service to which I now allude I need hardly point out to you. It is headed thus:—

"A CATECHISM—THAT IS TO SAY—AN INSTRUCTION TO BE LEARNED OF EVERY PERSON BEFORE HE BE BROUGHT TO BE CONFIRMED BY THE BISHOP."

Next to the catechism we come to another service, which is, as it were, its completion and fulfilment. We

may now suppose the child grown up. His mind is becoming mature and strong. He has learned his duty and his faith, and, according to the principle of nature, which is ever that of advance, he is now in spirit anxious to become more than he has been as yet; he wishes to draw nearer to God as he knows more about God; to be more fully a member of the Church as he learns more about the Church. He feels that hitherto he has been standing on the implied covenant of sponsors,—he is now desirous to enter upon a more personal covenant for himself,—to speak unto God with his own voice,—to dedicate his mind, and soul, and body to His service *in person*, —and as the world is opening before him with increased dangers and multiplying duties, so to have the Redeemer's promise of the Spirit strengthening and renovating him for the combat which he sees approaching. And for this the Church provides, in strict and beautiful analogy with the wants of her children, in that service which is headed—

"THE ORDER OF CONFIRMATION—OR LAYING ON OF HANDS UPON THOSE THAT ARE BAPTIZED AND ARE COME TO YEARS OF DISCRETION."

In this service a double confirmation takes place,—we confirm our baptismal pledges, and are confirmed by the Spirit. We receive strength and grace in fresh supplies, fulfilling that which was begun in baptism. Our flesh, and carnal appetites, and the world with its many attractions, are beginning to show our danger and our frailness, and we feel our need to invoke the Holy Ghost for fresh and renovating aid. The battle is at hand, so we would gird on the armour which God supplies,—"the girdle of truth, the breast-plate of righteousness, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit."

But the Christian is not yet in full union with Christ. Confirmation is only the threshold of his full membership; a threshold, indeed, over which it is necessary for him to pass; but if he stop thereat, he will, even then, fall short of a full knowledge of the mysteries, and a blessed assimilation to the life of Christ. Now we are told that

there are *two* sacraments necessary to salvation; and of these, even taking in Confirmation, only one has as yet been administered; but in order to fulfil our covenant in all respects we must advance to the other. Our Saviour says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." And the Church, in her Book of Common Prayer, says the same. Observe how she advances; from Baptism to the Catechism; from the Catechism to Confirmation; and now she bids us go forward again from Confirmation to the holy Eucharist. Let us read the rubric which occurs in the service for the baptism of grown-up persons. "It is expedient that every person thus baptized shall be confirmed by the bishop, so soon after his baptism as conveniently may be, *that so he may be admitted to the holy communion.*" And let us also look to the rubric at the end of the Confirmation service. "There shall none be admitted *to the holy communion* until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed." So that Confirmation is the point of union between the one sacrament and the other. Born into a new life by the one, we can only be sustained in that life by the other. Receiving the breath of life from God's holy Spirit in the one, we are now maintained in that Spirit by the other; namely, by eating and drinking sacramentally "the body and blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful." And thus we see prepared for us that which is called in the Prayer Book—

"THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, OR HOLY COMMUNION."

And here the analogy of life is complete; for as the birth of man is only once, so baptism is only once; but as the sustenance of man by food is continual, so the sacrament of the Lord's supper is continual. By the one, namely, the water, as the external sign, we are once washed and never can be washed again; by the other, namely, the bread and wine—which are to the faithful the body and blood of Christ—we are constantly and repeatedly to be filled. In thus remaining stedfast, according to

the Church's invitation, "we grow in grace" from day to day, "we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we are one with Christ and Christ with us."

So far then we have traced the Christian's course from his admission into the Church to his full membership. By this, as the ordinary course of spiritual life, *all* must go. But *after* this, when this ordinary course is *fulfilled*, what then? Are there not many vicissitudes; many estates of life into which we may enter; many occupations in which we may be engaged; many lapses and relapses by which we may fall, and fall again, away from God? Are we so secure in the course we have commenced as to need nothing further? The young communicant coming forth from his Confirmation to the altar of God for the first time, is about fifteen* or sixteen years of age. It is evident that many things, in the long prospect of his life, have yet to be en-

* Our bishops have usually made the age of Confirmation to be the fifteenth or sixteenth year. But with due deference to their opinion, it would appear that much is lost to the Church by the adoption of so advanced a period. Confirmation in former times was at a much earlier age. It would seem in the case of the male sex, and especially those of the poorer sort, that after the age of twelve they are altogether lost sight of, and escape from the eye of the Church. Up to the age of twelve, they are still found in our National and Parochial Schools, educated in the discipline of pastoral control, and with minds not averse to the teaching of the Church. After this, however, they pass away into the various labours of the world, and become apprentices or servants, and entirely disappear from all observation. Thousands wander away from the fold,—if badly inclined, into actual sin; or if religiously inclined, into Dissent. They are sent out into the world without the Church's blessing, and without the Church's warning; and it is no wonder that, as a consequence, they are never seen at the holy communion, to seal and complete their membership in the Church; whereas, if confirmation had been administered at the age of eleven or twelve, when the mind was yet comparatively innocent, and if, immediately after, the holy eucharist, as a necessary consequence, had followed,—then we might hope, from the great blessing with which this sacrament is by God's promise invested, their faith would have been determined, and their continuance in the Church made safe. From experience I can say, that it often happens that this period of life, namely, between twelve and sixteen, is the very period when the Church loses the affections of the poor, and the faithfulness of the rich; and in both cases the holy communion might, at that early age, have kept them faithful to their duties and engagements as her children.

countered. How often do the very best among us fall from the perfection of the Gospel, in spite of our striving. How many burst the barrier of God's law, and forgetful of all pledges, rush headlong into sin. And even of those who in any degree abide faithful in their baptismal purity, how many are ever changing their life from one state to another. What vicissitudes in the turns of what is called fortune encounter us. What sicknesses of body, what sorrow in affliction, what partings by death from those whom we love. But for all this, whatsoever it be, the Church is still ready with her Book of Common Prayer, "*praying without ceasing, in everything giving thanks.*"

For instance, if sin should overtake us; if by some sudden temptation we have been subdued by the enemy of souls, and have fallen; if we stand in jeopardy, and are in doubt; if we are discomfited and made sorry, through vanity and vexation of spirit; then does the Book of Common Prayer speak to us, as in her communion service, by God's holy minister, in these words:—"And because it is requisite, that no man should come to the holy communion, but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you, who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness."

But again, should it happen that we have plunged too deeply into sin to hear this voice; if lulled by false security in the privileges of our churchmanship, we have completely put away from ourselves all fear of God, and have become entirely castaways, still, are we deserted? Are we given up and abandoned to the enemy? Far from it; we are taught, faithfully taught, by the Prayer Book, even then not to despair. The Church sets before us once every year that most admirable form of service which is called,

"A COMMINATION, OR DENOUNCING OF GOD'S ANGER AND JUDGEMENTS AGAINST SINNERS."

A service is this, imbued with the most penitential character, being constructed alike to warn the impenitent, by a faithful denunciation of God's wrath against sin, and yet to comfort the penitent by the assurance of His mercy. The curses of the law are here faithfully depicted in order to alarm us, while the blessings of the Gospel are as faithfully pourtrayed in order to assure us. By this solemn service, if by anything, we are still called back, in whatsoever sin we be; still urged to be penitent; still reminded of God's love.

But we are not only to regard the changes in our character with respect to sin, but also the changes in our character with regard to our own social position. To some a state of celibacy seems preferable, and in that they abide through life. But many, on the other hand, seek marriage as being honourable in all. They go forth from the parental dwelling; they seek new relationships, new friends; they seek a partner and help-mate to share with them through life, its cares and sorrows, its joys and its prosperities. Accordingly, in strict analogy with this natural change, the Church prepares for us a service, which is called,

"THE FORM OF SOLEMNIZATION OF HOLY MATRIMONY."

Here, in the first place, we look to the law of God, which sanctified this estate as one of peculiar holiness, in the Old Testament, and confirmed it afterwards by our Lord, when He said:—"For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh." And in the second place, we look upon it as a peculiar and sacramental type of the Church—Christ being called "the bridegroom", and the Church "his spouse", representing therein the unity and love which exists between them. "This is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and his Church." Miserable indeed must they be who in this joyful and holy time refuse to look upon marriage as a religious rite, and enter upon a change of life so momentous in all its consequences, without God. Such there are; let us hope, however, but few.

But another change of life awaits some of us, of an equally and perhaps a more important character, inasmuch as by that change, not only our own responsibility, but the welfare of the whole community is more or less affected. I allude to holy orders. In this change of life—a consecration unto God for the work of the ministry,—a taking upon ourselves the office of a teacher of God's holy word, and a minister of His holy altar—what serious and solemn thoughts must crowd in upon us. And these thoughts are fully brought forward with all impressiveness in that part of our Prayer Book which is called *The Ordinal*. Herein such of the laity as take upon themselves the holy orders of the Church, pledge themselves before God and the people; hands are laid upon them as by the apostles of old; they go forth different men, as it were, set apart for the work of the ministry; God's special servants for ever. If before, even as laymen, they were holy unto God by baptism, how much more are they so, when, in addition to being Christians, they are made priests, coming out from the ordinary world, and being separate. Let us read that peculiarly solemn service which is called in the Prayer Book,—

"THE FORM AND MANNER OF MAKING, ORDAINING, AND CONSECRATING OF BISHOPS, PRIESTS, AND DEACONS,"

and there we shall see amply set forth the high character which the Church demands for her priesthood, and the solemnity of their separation from things common or unclean. Woe be unto him who enters lightly or frivolously on this holy estate.

And now still further: there are times and circumstances of life which ever and anon, by God's all-wise permission, come upon us either for good or for evil, as we ourselves receive them;—times which apply to *all*, both married and unmarried, both righteous and unrighteous, both clergy and laity, both young and old. Sickness visits our dwellings;—disease and pain become our companions;—we are drawn away from active intercourse with the world, and in the retirement of the sick chamber, our attention is arrested, and we are taught to

think, by God's visitation, of the transitory character of all that surrounds us here. Then if, in these circumstances, we desire to turn to God, as it surely is His will that we should, the Prayer Book is again ready with her holy offices of comfort and teaching. We find there prayers for every sort of sickness, psalms of submission to God's will, exhortations, warnings. The sick man is questioned concerning his faith, moved to confession of his sins, exhorted to repentance, and if, oppressed with the burden of his sins, he should desire it, he may receive one of the greatest consolations which can be derived on earth from man to man,—he can receive the ministerial absolution of his sins in these solemn words of the Church: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences. And by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." All this is found in a service headed

"THE ORDER FOR THE VISITATION OF THE SICK."

And then, since in the time of sorrow, or in the hour of approaching death, there can be no greater consolation to the Christian than to be made partaker of His Lord, to remember in His body and blood the meritorious cause of his justification, to communicate with Him, and be one with Him,—because there can be no greater consolation to the sick or dying man than this—there follows closely after the visitation another service, entitled

"THE COMMUNION OF THE SICK."

The Church would not have her faithful ones to depart from her visible communion without passing them on, as far as in her lies, to the invisible communion of the saints in Christ. She would not send them on their long last journey without the comfort of the closest and most intimate fellowship with Christ in suffering and in death which it is in her power to bestow; and so she places by their side, even in the last hour, this holy sacrament, to strengthen, cheer, and comfort them in their passage through the valley of the shadow of death.

And so the time draws on. As these, however, are the *casualties* of life, it does not follow that all men should need the various services here provided. Some are strong in health and vigorous in body through a long life. Some pass on from manhood to old age without matrimony, without holy orders, without sickness, and never need apply to the Church's service book, save only when in their public worship they praise God for His goodness, and for the wonderful works which He has done for the children of men. Some, too, are cut off by sudden and violent deaths, and no time is given them to think of prayer or communion, and they pass away in the midst of their years and are as though they never had been. Some, too, are calm in spirit and equable in temper, and pass along life's course for their appointed time, without trouble, or sorrow, or poverty, or any other cause for vexation of spirit. But be this as it may, the lot of ordinary life is abundantly chequered with the changes and vicissitudes of sickness, of sin, and of sorrow, and at any rate these casual services fully show the care and love of the Church for her members in preparing them; they show her anxious watchfulness over all, in making ready her ministrations and holy helps for all seasons, and for every sort and condition of men. But, as I have said, the time draws on. Whether we have passed a life of sickness or of health; whether repentance has found us penitents; or whether, heedless of sin, we have lived in a hardened and godless state; whatever we have been, and however we have lived, still there is one event which happeneth to all —DEATH. Death with all its pains and terrors; death with all its parting from our beloved ones; its awful struggles on the confines of the unknown eternity, its bodily pangs, as well as its mental anticipations of hope and fear,—this death must come for all. First, we have to look upon it in others: our parents, our beloved children, the partner of our bosom, our brethren, our friends; and secondly, we have to look upon it in ourselves. First, we have to carry forth those whom we love, and secondly, those whom we love will have to carry us forth. They will lay our body in the cold grave, where the worm will

work its destruction. Our bones, crumbling into corruption, will return unto the dust from whence they came, while the spirit goes to the God who gave it. And is the Church forgetful of us here? After having conducted us so far on our way, is she silent now? Does our Service Book close up its pages and say nothing to the mourner? Does it say nothing to ourselves of our hopes of immortality and our life in Christ? Surely not so. Our Church steps forth here again with one of the most sublime and comforting forms of prayer which can be conceived for the sorrowing heart of man :—

"THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD."

This concludes the scene. "I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord. He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die." Who has ever witnessed this sublime service of the Church, and is not called back in memory by the sound of these words to the burial of some beloved one? The "dust to dust" and "ashes to ashes"; the solemn mourners going through the streets; the bell tolling its last for the memory of him who is gone; the gentle voice of God's priest as he chants the solemn words: "Man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live, and is full of misery. He cometh up and is cut down like a flower, he fleeth as it were a shadow, and never continueth in one stay. Yet, O Lord most holy, O Lord most mighty, O holy and most merciful Saviour, deliver us not into the bitter pains of *eternal* death":—who thinks upon such words without feeling cause to thank God for that faithful book which records them, so full of comfort, full of warning, full of instruction to the very last?

Little more need now be added. The principle for which I have been contending, that of analogy with human life, is clearly now made out. A few short reflections will close our subject.

In the first place, let us reflect on the commonness of this possession. The book is now, by the cheapness of its price, and by the extension of the capability of reading, so

universally within reach, that no one, unless with his own will, need be without it. It is found in the cottage as well as in the palace; it is the treasure of the peasant, next to his copy of the Scriptures, as well as the instructor of the royal and the noble. While, then, we reflect with comfort on the universality of this blessing, and the fact of its general use throughout the land, we cannot but reflect also, with pain, on the strange neglect and ignorance of all things appertaining to it, which continue to prevail. This book has formed the teaching of our country for three hundred years; it has been used by our clergy in their every-day administrations of the rites of the Church from generation to generation, yet, strange to say, few bestow any pains to learn what it teaches, or to abide by what it says. We cannot but wonder at the vast loss which this book has sustained on all sides at the hands both of laity and clergy,—by being curtailed of its fair proportions, shorn of its discipline, robbed of its most precious jewels, stripped and laid bare of its highest ornaments in almost every page. Perhaps the time is now coming when we shall use it better, as we understand it more, and *because* we understand it more. May the spirit of God be on our people, that, as in patience and submission they study its lessons, they may obey its precepts more cheerfully, and live according to its laws in greater gentleness and faith.

Again, when we reflect on the universality of this book, in another sense, that of providing its spiritual food in conjunction with the Scriptures, for every age and circumstance of life; that of its embodying in a portable and succinct shape, forms of devotion, for every chance or change of this mortal life; we cannot then but wonder at its general disuse, save in the formal and compulsory manner in which, by the law of the land, it is used in public by a congregation. The Prayer Book ought to be considered not only as a *public* service book, but as a *private* manual of prayer as well: it should be the pattern of all our dealings with God, the guide of our daily path, the sustenance of our spiritual needs in the family and the closet, as well as in the church. I do not think that I

should be without justification in saying, that it is the duty of our people,—unless in cases of necessity, such as sickness, distance, or other great hindrances of like kind,—faithfully to abide by this manual of devotion daily, in the very church itself; but wheresoever these cases of necessity do exist and may be allowed, there certainly, I should say, that if any book should be taken up as the manual of family prayer, this book should be the one. But how far is it from being so in general. How many hundreds of forms of prayer we see issuing from the press, and after having been eagerly caught after for the passing moment, then die out with the satiety of those who use them. This very satiety and the consequent desire of novelty continually arising, speak at once in condemnation of such vain attempts. Now if our people would but resort to that which is before them; which is given them by the Church, and not by individuals; which bears upon it the experience of ages—the stamp of its truth and of its value as a vehicle of devotion—then would a more sober and healthy tone of mind arise with respect to religious doctrines than that which now too frequently prevails.* And as I would

* It is curious to observe in all the forms of family prayer which have been brought before the public, how they have failed in proportion as they have deviated from the spirit and form of our Prayer-book. In general we find in them two great errors:—the first is, great length; and the second, want of correct language. We observe in our Prayer-book that the services are broken up and varied,—now a prayer, now a psalm, now short suffrages, now a collect—by which variety the mind is kept alive and intent, and the office of praying is in the mind fulfilled; whereas in the long prayers of private individuals, without break or variety, the mind is exhausted and lost, and long before we have arrived at their termination we have lost all connected idea of the subject on which our minds should have been intently engaged. The collects and prayers in our liturgy generally give us one subject, one leading idea; on that leading idea the mind is capable of dwelling; but when a multitude of subjects are brought forward, one after another, nothing is gained but weariness and wandering. The second great error in the private family prayers which are in vogue, is the extreme injudiciousness and want of taste shewn in the language of the prayers. Sometimes familiar expressions, which are highly painful to a devout mind, are applied to God and our Saviour. Sometimes doctrines are brought forward, in a secret and underhand manner, opposed to the teaching of the Church. Sometimes personalities are indulged in, and references made to in-

say this for family devotion, so I would also say it for our private prayers as well, because I think that we should never, even as individuals, lose sight of our membership in the Church. The more we retire into ourselves, and pray only for ourselves, and in our own words, and after the suggestions of our own thoughts, the more do we peril catholicity of feeling, and that sweet consolation and hope that is inseparable from the fellowship of the saints, and the communion of the faithful. Not but that there may be many topics which are rightly the subjects of private prayer, but still they may be found expressed in the words of the Church, in most instances; and he who bears about him his Prayer Book, as the Church's formulary, and in humble spirit prays in her words, not as of himself, but as of her, will soon acquire within him a generous, a faithful, and a catholic spirit.

What feeling of the mind is there which our Prayer Book will not clothe for us in far better words than we can frame for ourselves?

Is our feeling that of exultation and joy at some great blessing from God? Let it burst forth in some of the Canticles or Psalms of David.

Is our feeling that of sorrow and depression of heart by reason of some affliction from God? Let it supplicate Him in the penitential tones of the Litany.

Is our feeling that of an earnest longing for some of the graces and gifts of the Spirit? Let it give itself vent in the short but emphatic collects.

Is our feeling that of depression under sin? Let it fall down before God in the solemn petitions of the Commination service.

Is our feeling that of doubt in some article of faith, or

dividuals, and comparisons made between the members of a family, all of which in a sensitive mind produce anything but devotion. Observe our collects:—how pure the language; how reverential: how well selected the words; not a syllable inserted more than the sense requires; no fine writing; no display; but the simple language of prayer, in humility, gentleness, and charity. I would say, confidently, that there is no guard against some sort of evil in family prayer, but in the *book* which the Church provides. In that, all that is required may at any time be found, and so found as in no other book.

of misgiving concerning some doctrine of the Church? Let us say to ourselves, as the preservative against all heresy, the Apostles' Creed, or the Nicene, or, perhaps, the more full and glorious exposition of the Catholic doctrine, the Creed of S. Athanasius.

And so I might go on. But this is enough to show the universal adaptation of this book, of which we treat. Its guardian hand is held out for all; its catholic spirit speaks with the loud voice of guidance and succour to every sort and condition of man. It is as our life.

The greater portion of this book will already have been brought to bear upon the relations of most of those who read these pages. To most of us those periods to which they refer will never occur again. Our day of *holy Baptism*, for instance, is gone. No more shall the holy water of the font be poured upon our foreheads, and give us, by the promise of Christ, the spirit of regeneration. Our days of *Catechising* too are gone; no more shall we give heed, with awakened and intent mind, to the expositions of the pastor, instructing us in the rudiments of the faith, as babes in Christ. Our solemn day of *Confirmation* too is gone; no more shall we pledge ourselves, in earnest anticipation of the coming conflict, to obey and love God, while the bishop's hand is laid upon us, invoking His Spirit who alone can give us strength. And then the day which saw us with trembling knees at our *first Communion*, bowing down at the steps of God's altar; full of that awful and reverential love, half of hope and half of dread, with which the Body and the Blood of our Redeemer first touched our lips; that too is gone. And then to many of us our joyful day, not unmixed with care, however, and anxious hope, our day of *holy Matrimony;* that too is gone. And now life stands before us in its residue, wearing away apace.

One thing, however, remains; one thing only, which as long as we abide in the Church we may hope for in all assurance of faith; *but one thing only.* Trusting and believing in our Redeemer through what remains of life, we may hope that He will "make our bed in our sickness," that His priest shall stand by our side ministering, from

the Book of Common Prayer, the services of the Church, and, praying for us and with us—shall bid us "God speed" on our final journey. The last words that shall sound above our body when it shall be committed to the earth (though then we shall not hear them), will be these —"I know that my Redeemer liveth"; and the last voice that shall be with us, as at the beginning, so at the end, will be the voice of the Church with her heavenly blessing —"Blessed are the dead, that die in the Lord; yea, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours."

THE END.

INDEX

OF THE

PRINCIPAL MATTERS.

	PAGE
ACT OF UNIFORMITY.—At present regulates the Prayer Book	46
ALTAR.—Use of the word	236
How to be placed and ornamented	237
Lights upon, commanded by the rubric	242
ANTHEMS.—Examples of, in Breviary	66
The place for, and how to be sung in the English Church	299
Verse psalms, a substitute for	299
BISHOPS.—Ancient British, prior to Rome, mentioned by name	42
Their spiritual rule in dioceses	259
Comparison of number in England with other Churches	278
Additional number required	277
Apostolical succession of, in England	221
BREVIARY.—Meaning of the word	60
Specimens of	61
CANONICAL HOURS—explained	85
CEREMONIES.—Value of	100
Scriptural foundation of	102
Christian	104
Apostolic	106
Spoken of by the Fathers	107
Unwise additions of, by Rome	111
Abolition of some, at the Reformation	112
Difference of Edward the Sixth's first book and the present, in regard to	114
CHANTING—the Psalms, ancient method of	289
The Litany	296
The Communion Service	297
Objections to by Puritans	294
by others	299-306
In Wales, prior to S. Augustin	292
CHOIRS.—First founded in England by S. Augustin at Canterbury	291
Usual in private chapels of nobility and bishops	292
CHORAL SERVICE.—Jewish institution of	283
Commencement of, in Christianity	287
"Planus Cantus," meaning of	288
Originated by S. Ignatius	290
Retention of, in Reformation	293
Objections to, by Puritans	294
Hooker's defence of	295

PAGE

Traced in the Prayer Book 296
Metrical psalms not commanded . . 301
Objections to, by various persons at present . 299 306
Used even in the Protestant Churches . . 307
CHURCH—of England, prior to Rome in England . . 30
Her middle path 51
Of Anglo Saxons, distinct from British . . 36
Similitude to Rome, no argument against in England . 118
First, built by Constantine 184
Ancient names of 186
Ancient divisions of 187
Symbolizing the parts of 197
Ornaments of 231
Definition of the 255
Pastoral character of 257
Not to be guided by public opinion . . . 306
Not to be guided by private judgment . . 306 307
CLERGY.—Number of, deficient 276
Three orders of 220
Pastoral character required in 258
Holding pluralities objectionable . . . 273
DAILY SERVICE.—Custom of all nations . . . 78
Jewish 80
Apostolic 81
Commanded by the Church of England . . 87
Duty of laity and clergy in regard to . . . 88
Testimonies of Catholic writers in the English Church in regard to 88 90
Takes precedence of family worship . . . 94
Neglect of, by the English people . . . 96
DIOCESES.—Origin of 259
Subdivided into parishes 262
Ancient, in England 32
DIRECTORY.—Equally a form with Liturgy . . . 23
Specimen of 23 4
Took the place of Prayer Book 43
DISSENT.—Arising from want of pastoral character of Church . 274
Difference between prayers of Dissenter and Catholic . 301
Insufficiency of Dissenters' pretended ministerial acts . 224
DIVISION OF THE SERVICES—necessary for their full effect . . 305
EDWARD VI.—Difference between the First book and all succeeding . 40
What ceremonies retained in 114
What parts in it require choral service . . 297
EMBER DAYS.—An English fast. Necessity of observance . . 157
EVES—Distinction of, from vigils 158
FAMILY WORSHIP.—not to supersede Church Worship . . 94
FASTS.—General principle of 147
Jewish system brought into Christianity . . 149
The English Fasts 152
FASTING.—Meaning of, and its ends 161

PAGE

FASTING.—Its advantages 164
To what extent to be carried 165
Abuses in, to be avoided 168
Objections to, about Rome 171
FEASTS.—General principle of their observance . . . 127
Jewish 128
Christian 129
Romish additions to those of ancient Churches . . 132
The English Feasts—their observance binding . 134-6
Observance of, distinct from Romish error . . 136
Objections to, about Rome 136
from certain texts . . . 141
Violation of, by the English people . . . 143
FRIDAY.—The weekly fast of the English Church, how neglected . 161
HUMAN LIFE.—Analogy of Prayer Book with . . . 311
Birth 313
Growth in childhood . . 317
Full growth . . . 319
Manhood 320
Falling 322
Marriage 323
Holy Orders . . . 324
Sickness 325
Death 327
LANGUAGE.—Prayer in an unknown, not ancient . . . 75
Reasons for it suggested by Rome . . . 72
Testimonies against it 73
LEGENDS.—Specimens introduced into breviary . . 67
LENT.—Observance of, very ancient 154
How observed by English Church . . . 155
LESSONS.—Of Scripture, Romish way of reading . . 61
Interspersed with profane writings . . 65
LITURGY.—Meaning of the word 29
Ancient 21
In each diocese independent . . . 37
First Reform of, in England . . . 39
NOCTURN.—Meaning of, in reference to the division of the psalms . 58
ORNAMENTS.—Principle of 240
Of the Church. Altar 235
Font 238
Inscriptions . . . 240
Roof 241
Of Ministers. Ecclesiastical vestments . . 244
Names of . . . 246
PASTOR.—Character of, belonging to the priest . . 258
Traced through Scripture . . . 257
Dioceses and parishes denote the care of . . 262
Causes of the deficiency of, in the Church . . 273
How the laity might restore the pastoral charge . 279
PEWS.—Why objectionable 190-3

PAGE

PIE.—Meaning of the word 59
PLACES.—Holy. First institution of 175
Jewish principle 177
Upper rooms 182
Synagogues and Proseuchæ 180
Churches 183
See CHURCH.
PLURALITIES.—One of the causes of the failure of our Church . 273
Avarice imputed to the clergy in . . .
POSTURES OF BODY.—What required in Church service . . 122
PRAYER.—Principle of 2
Requisites for 3
Objections to liturgical form 4
Extemporaneous, compared with written . . . 4
Advantages of liturgical 8
How often public Prayer 11-78
Rules of the English Church 87
Baxter's opinion about forms imposed . . . 7
Testimonies to the duty of daily prayer . . . 88
Objections to daily prayer 91
Traced from the Jews to our Lord and the Apostles . 15-19
Not to be preached or made impressive . . . 300
PRIESTHOOD.—Use of the word 214
The patriarchal and legal 204-6
The order of Melchisedec 212
Apostolic 213 4
Everlasting in the Christian Church . . . 219
Antiquity of the three orders of 220-1
Duty of, to the people 225
PURITANS.—Their hatred of the Prayer Book . . . 42
Objections of, to ceremonies . . . 101-117
Objections of, to churches and ornaments . . . 194
Objections of, to choral service . . . 294
ROGATION DAYS.—Meaning of, an English fast . . . 155
REFORMATION.—Not the origination of English Church . . 35
Traced in the Prayer Book 39
SCRIPTURE.—Reading of, a part of Divine worship, ancient . 55
Jewish custom of 55
Romish abuse of 57
How regulated in Prayer Book . . . 70
SEES.—Ancient British, before the time of S. Augustin . . 35
SURPLICE.—Use of, in the Sermon 248
Canons and rubrics concerning 260
VIGILS.—Meaning of, an English fast 158
Distinct from Eves 158

RICHARDS, PRINTER, ST. MARTIN'S LANE.

A CATALOGUE

OF

NEW, STANDARD, AND POPULAR BOOKS,

PUBLISHED BY W. J. CLEAVER,

80, BAKER STREET.

THOUGHTS ON THE OBSERVANCE OF LENT, by Sir Archibald Edmonstone, Bart., author of the "Christian Gentleman's Daily Walk;" in royal 32mo. elegantly bound, price 6d.

A CATECHISM FOR SOPHS, by the Rev. H. M. Grover, B.C.L. Rector of Hitcham, Bucks; in fcap. 8vo. cloth, red edges, price 2s.

This summary of Scriptural doctrines is designed to give settled and correct views upon several subjects relating to the spiritual world, which suggest themselves more especially to those whose minds are directed to the researches of ancient literature.

By the same Author,

A VOICE FROM STONEHENGE; in demy 8vo. part I, and to be continued in parts.

This work proposes to investigate the rumours of Antiquity relative to the origin of the Druidical Temples, and the ancient families of Europe.

Tradition and Fable are made subservient to the purposes of this enquiry, in connection with the relics of antiquity,—monumental, physical, and moral; and the three orders of indirect testimony are brought to bear upon each other, for elucidating the circumstances of the early ages to which they apply. The elements of the enquiry are derived wholly from literary sources, the fruits of other men's observations. The combination of these scattered notices, which at present lie in detached and unappropriated fragments, are found to disclose many circumstances of remote history; and the three weird Sisters, by casting their spells into a common crucible, are made to raise up forms of departed ages, into new and visible appreciation.

The work will be published in parts, and be prepared for binding into suitable volumes at its close. As the object is, "to investigate," the Editor would be happy to receive any remarks on the published numbers, which should be noticed as far as possible in each succeeding part, in an appendix, so as not to deteriorate from the integrity of the principal work. Such, being directed to the Publisher, would receive due attention.

In 32mo. gilt edges, price 3d., or on a Sheet for Vestries, price 4d.

CLEAVER'S COMPANION FOR CHURCHMEN, a Calendar: containing the Lessons with the Vigils, Fasts, and Festivals, &c., as they are appointed to be read, or observed, by the United Church of England and Ireland in her Book of Common Prayer, daily throughout the year 1848.

"This is just what it pretends to be, and no more. It is simply a Churchman's Almanac, giving all necessary knowledge of the Church's Year, and thus peculiarly valuable as a reference to every one who is desirous of following out her system."—*Theologian.*

"This is a very convenient little publication."—*Oxford University Herald.*

"Of all the Almanacs already issued for the year 1848, Cleaver's 'Companion for Churchmen' seems to be the very best. It fully sets before a Churchman what he is to do religiously every day in the year. It can be forwarded under a letter stamp; and will be found most useful to parish clerks."—*Church of England Journal.*

In royal 32mo. for Children and Schools,

A MINIATURE COMMENTARY ON THE COLLECTS, by the Rev. C. C. Spencer, M.A., Senior Assistant-Curate of S. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge. (Nearly ready.)

Third edition, now ready, price 2d., by post 3d., or 14s. per 100.

AN EASY CATECHISM ON THE APOSTLES' CREED, by the Rev. John Williams, M.A., of Nerquis, Diocese of St. Asaph. Author of "Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymry." 16mo. sewed, for Schools, &c.

By the same Author,

A FEW PLAIN AND PRACTICAL OBSERVATIONS ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. 12mo. sewed, for distribution, price 4d. Also,

THE ECCLESIASTICAL ANTIQUITIES OF THE CYMRY; or, the Ancient British Church; its History, Doctrine, and Rites. 1 vol. 8vo. second edition, price 10s. 6d. (Nearly ready.)

In 1 vol. foolscap 8vo. price 5s. cloth.

LECTURES EXPOSITORY AND PRACTICAL, ON THE BOOK OF DANIEL; delivered in the Parish Church of Madron, Cornwall, by the Rev. Wm. Wood, A.M.

In 8vo. sewed, price 2s. 6d.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY, AND THE CHURCH IN CHAINS. Being an attempt to set forth the grounds upon which a number of the Clergy are at present associated, to obtain a Restoration of Corrective Discipline in the English Church. By James Bradley Sweet, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Woodville, Leicestershire.

"The Services of the Church were made for those who wish to go on regularly in a course of Christian teaching, and Christian performance: and then we may reasonably hope that their eternal state will be a happy one. We cannot make a religious service for those who break their Christian vows, and live in opposition to the laws of a Holy Church. They must answer for themselves."—*Village Conversations on the Burial Service*, by George Davys, D.D., Bishop of Peterborough.

THE REV. WILLIAM BENNETT'S WORKS.

THE EUCHARIST, its History, Doctrine, and Practice, with Meditations and Prayers suitable to that Holy Sacrament. Second edition. In demy 8vo. 12s. cloth, uniform with "Distinctive Errors of Romanism," and "The Principles of the Book of Common Prayer."

PRINCIPLES OF THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER CONSIDERED; a Series of Lecture Sermons. 8vo. cloth, 12s.

(An edition of this book is published in a cheap form for Lending and Parochial Libraries, &c., with a view to extensive circulation.)

DISTINCTIVE ERRORS OF ROMANISM; a Series of Lecture Sermons, preached during Lent, 1842. Third edition, 8vo. cloth, price 13s. Each Lecture sold separately, price 8d.

SERMONS ON MISCELLANEOUS SUBJECTS, with Introduction, Notes, &c. Two vols. 12mo. price 14s. bds.; or separately, Vol. I, 6s. 6d., Vol. II, 7s. 6d.

GUIDE TO THE HOLY EUCHARIST, forming in the second volume a Companion to the Altar. 2 vols. 18mo. 8s. cloth.

In demy 8vo., third edition, sewed, price 1s.

SINS OF THE CHURCH AND PEOPLE, a Sermon Preached at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, on the Vigil of the Annunciation, 1847, being also the National Fast Day; with an Appendix, concerning the Holy Communion on Days of Fasting. *The profits to be given to the distressed Irish.*

ON THE SCHISM OF CERTAIN PRIESTS AND OTHERS lately in Communion with the Church. A Sermon preached at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, on the Twenty-second Sunday after Trinity, 1845. Second edition, 8vo. price 6d.

THREE SERMONS, explaining the New Marriage Act with regard to Churchmen and Dissenters. 12mo. price 1s.

Also in demy 8vo. price 3s., sewed,

CRIME AND EDUCATION; the Duty of the State therein.

In demy 8vo. price 6d. sewed,

A PASTORAL LETTER TO HIS PARISHIONERS.

TABLE OF CHURCH SERVICE, at Matins and Evensong. Demy 8vo. on a card, printed in red and black, price 2d. or 14s. per 100 for distribution.

TABLE OF CHURCH SERVICE, at the Office for Holy Communion. On a card, price 2d. or 14s. per 100 for distribution.

In 8vo. price 6d.

THE BRITISH CHAPLAINCY IN MADERIA; by Viscount Campden. Reprinted, with additions, from the *Theologian and Ecclesiastic* for November, 1847.

In 8vo. price 6d.

A REPLY to certain portions of Lord John Russell's Letter to the Clergy of Bedford, relating to Dr. Hampden's Appointment to the See of Hereford; by a Layman of the Church of England.

In 8vo. price 4d.

A LETTER to Lord John Russell on the Nomination of Dr. Hampden, by an Englishman.

In 8vo. price 6d.

THE SPIRIT OF ROMANISM; a Sermon preached at S. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge, on the twenty-fourth Sunday after Trinity, 1847; by the Rev. George Nugee, M.A.

DEVOTIONAL WORKS,

ADAPTED TO THE USE OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, FROM THE WORKS OF FOREIGN DIVINES,

EDITED BY THE REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT, and the Supplement: with The Path of Paradise; or the Peace of the Soul. By Scupoli. (From the Italian.) With Frontispiece, 3s. 6d.

THE YEAR OF AFFECTIONS; or, Sentiments on the Love of God, drawn from the Canticles, for every day in the year. By Avrillon. 6s. 6d.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE. (A Commentary on Thomas a Kempis.) By Surin. 4s. 6d.

A GUIDE FOR PASSING ADVENT HOLILY. By Avrillon. With Frontispiece. 6s.

A GUIDE FOR PASSING LENT HOLILY. By Avrillon. Second edition, with Frontispiece. 7s.

PARADISE FOR THE CHRISTIAN SOUL. By Horst. 2 vols. 6s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST IN GLORY; Daily Meditations from Easter Day to the Wednesday after Trinity Sunday. By Nouet. 8s.

SOME MEDITATIONS AND PRAYERS selected from the way of Eternal Life; translated from the Latin, and adapted to the use of the English Church, by the Rev. Isaac Williams, B.D., of Trinity College, Oxford. Author of the "Baptistery," &c. &c. 1 vol. 8vo. cloth, price 10s. 6d.

A VOLUME OF SERMONS; by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., (nearly ready).

In 18mo. cloth, price 1s. 6d.

AIDS TO A HOLY LIFE, in Forms for Self-Examination, general and particular; compiled from various sources, with an introduction, explaining the manner in which the duty should be performed; by the late Thomas H. B. Bund, A.M., a Priest of the English Church.

"That the duty of self-examination is becoming more evident, and that its advantages are more generally acknowledged, may be inferred from the publication of this plain manual on the subject, and it gives us great pleasure to be able to recommend it very strongly to our readers.

"It is almost entirely free from the general fault of such works,—that of attempting too much, and thus disheartening those who attempt to use them."—*English Churchman.*

CLOSE'S (The late Rev. Henry Jackson) FAMILY PRAYERS. Second edition, 18mo. cloth, price 1s. 6d.

Also, in 1 vol. post 8vo. price 2s. 6d. cloth,

A GUIDE TO FAMILY DEVOTION, in a Series of Supplications, Prayers, and Thanksgivings, intended for the use of the Godly.

JARVIS'S CHRONOLOGICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH; being a New Enquiry into the true Dates of the Birth and Death of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and containing an original Harmony of the Four Gospels, arranged in the exact order of time: by the Rev. Samuel Farmar Jarvis, D.D., L.L.D., Historiographer of the Church, Member of the American Philosophical Society. 8vo. price 25s. cloth.

By the same Author,

HOLY OF HOLIES seen through the Sanctuary. A Sermon preached in the Church of All Souls, S. Marylebone, the First Sunday after Trinity, 1844, being the day appointed by the Lord Bishop of London for a general devotion of the Offertory, within his Lordship's Diocese, to the increase of Churches in the Metropolis.

In fcap. 8vo. vol. 1, price 6s. cloth,

LIVES OF CERTAIN FATHERS OF THE CHURCH, in the Fourth Century, for the instruction of the Young. Edited by the Rev. W. J. E. Bennett, M.A., Perpetual Curate of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge.

By the same Author,

THE NAVVIES, No. I.—Harry Johnson. No. II.—Frank Meade. 24mo. stiff covers, price 3d. Also,

TALES OF KIRKBECK: or, the Parish in the Fells. 1 vol. 12mo. elegantly bound. (Nearly ready).

In 1 vol. demy 8vo. price 1s. 6d. cloth,

DALTON'S FOUR LECTURES on the First and Second Advent of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; delivered in the Parish Church of Leeds, by the Rev. Henry Dalton, A.M., Trinity College, Dublin.

By the same Author, in 8vo. price 6d. (Published by request.)

BODY, SOUL, AND SPIRIT. A Sermon.

Also, in 8vo. price 6d.

OUR TWO DANGERS. Reprinted with slight alterations from the *Theologian.* (Published by request.)

In 1 vol. fcap. 8vo. price 6s. cloth bds.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. By the Rev. Matthew Plummer, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Heworth, Durham.

Librum sacerdotalem quis nostrum resignare audeat, signatum a confessoribus et multorum jam, martyrio consecratum.—S. Ambrose.

"This volume has already, in great part, appeared in our pages, and is now reprinted with many valuable additions, and some alterations. It contains a

series of illustrations and observations on the Book of Common Prayer, taken from a wide range of authors, both ancient and modern, and arranged according to the order of the Prayer Book itself, so that a person desirous of finding what is said on any particular portion of our Services, would at once be able to refer to the portion of the volume in which it will be found.

"To the young members of the Ministry, and indeed to all, but to the young especially, this volume will furnish a good deal of valuable assistance. But a few years have elapsed since a clergyman, appointed to the care of a parish, was accustomed to follow the corrupt practice which he found in use, without even giving himself the trouble to inquire what was the right method of performing the duty. Hence the great corruptions which everywhere exist.

"Recently, we are thankful to say, that very general attention has been paid to the proprieties of the Service; and, though it may not always follow that a Clergyman who has turned his attention to these matters will find himself in a position to follow out the directions of the Church—such is the extraordinary prejudice that still prevails—still it is most important that the clergy should at least be aware of what is right, in order that, as occasion serves, they may bring back our Church Service to its original purity. Recent discussions have tended to mystify the rules of the Church in some instances, owing to the perverse ingenuity of those who were determined to uphold existing abuses. This little volume will be found peculiarly useful to remedy this evil, by bringing forward a number of facts and illustrations by which a sound judgment may be formed."—*English Churchman.*

By the same Author,

THE CLERGYMAN'S ASSISTANT IN VISITING THE SICK; to which are added the Offices for the Communion of the Sick, and for the Private Baptism of Infants. 1 vol. 12mo. cloth, limp, red edges, suitable for the pocket, price 3s. 6d.

HYMNS FOR THE WEEK AND SEASONS, translated from the Latin. 1 vol. fcap. 8vo. cloth, price 4s.

ALICE PARKER; by the Author of Susan Carter, &c. &c., price 2d.

THE REV. WILLIAM HEYGATE'S WORKS.

PROBATIO CLERICA; or, Aids in Self-Examination to Candidates for Holy Orders, or for those of the Clergy who may desire them, with hints on College Life. Foolscap 8vo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

In fcap. 8vo. price 2d.

AN EARNEST ADDRESS TO YOUNG CHURCHMEN Upon Present Spiritual Temptation. By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, A.M., Author of "Probatio Clerica," &c.

In fcap. price 2d. sewed,

THE HOUSE OF SPIRITS; an Allegory. By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, M.A., Author of "Probatio Clerica."

FRIDAY DEVOTIONS; or, Prayers and Exercises in Historical Order. 12mo. sewed, 4d.

THE SMUGGLER WARNED; or, the History of Isaac Wilson. 12mo. price 2d.

JUDGE NOT; or, an Earnest Warning to the Youth of this Generation against a Critical and Controversial Spirit. Price 2d.

FLEE FORNICATION; a Sermon preached on the Fourth Sunday after the Epiphany, and published in the believed absence of any Tract upon the subject. Price 2d.

AN EXTRACT FROM ARCHDEACON HARE'S SERMON, intended for the Student to paste in the cover of any much-used book. Price One Halfpenny.

HYMNARIUM ANGLICANUM; or the Ancient Hymns of the Anglican Church; translated from the Latin of the Salisbury Breviary, and fitted to the tunes used in Churches. 18mo. cloth, gilt edges, price 2s.

In 1 vol. foolscap 8vo. cloth, price 1s. 6d.

A MANUAL OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR, adapted to the use of Classical, and of the Upper Classes in Parochial, Schools. By the Rev. Charles J. Smith, M.A., of Christchurch, Oxford; late Curate of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge; Domestic and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Jamaica.

"This little book is of the highest quality, containing simple and sensible directions on the use of words."—*Spectator.*

"This is an excellent compendium of Grammar, and bids fair to supersede the dull and meagre abridgments of Murray, with which our Schools have so long been oppressed. The explanations are clear and concise, and calculated to convey a far deeper and more accurate view of the fundamental principles of language than is commonly attained by our youth.

"We venture to say, that the proper use of this little Manual will do much to remedy serious defects in our popular education."—*Irish Ecclesiastical Journal.*

By the same Author, in demy 8vo: price 1s. sewed,

ONE HOME IN ALL LANDS; a Farewell Sermon, preached in S. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge.

PUSEYISM, a Short Dialogue between a Lady and a Parson. Fourth thousand. Foolscap 8vo. price 1d. or 7s. per 100.

SHEPPERTON MANOR; or, The Days of Bishop Andrewes. By the Rev. J. Mason Neale, M.A., author of "Herbert Tresham," &c. &c. Fcap. 8vo. price 5s. cloth.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE SAINTS' DAYS AND OTHER FESTIVALS. Lectures delivered in the Parish Church of Burghfield, Berks, by the Rev. Henry Curtis Cherry, M.A., Rector, Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord de Saumarez. Fcap. 8vo. 2 vols. in one, price 9s. cloth.

TEARS OF THE CHURCH.

LACHRYMÆ ECCLESIÆ; The Anglican Reformed Church and her Clergy in the Days of their Destitution and Suffering, during the Great Rebellion of the Seventeenth Century. By the Rev. George Wyatt, LL.B., F.S.A. Rector of Burghwallis, Doncaster. Second edition, fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth.

LETTERS ON CONFIRMATION. A Manual of Moral and Religious Duties, designed for the Young of her own sex in the Upper Ranks of Society; by a Lady. In 1 vol. fcap. 8vo. price 2s. 6d. cloth.

CHURCHMAN'S SUNDAY EVENINGS AT HOME; by the Rev. Alexander Watson, M.A., Curate of S. John's, Cheltenham. 2 vols. 12mo. price 18s. cloth; or separately, Vol. 1, 7s. 6d. Vol. 2, 10s. 6d.

By the same Author,

THE PRAYER BOOK A SAFE GUIDE; or, The Devout Churchman's Way of Faith and Practice. Lectures delivered at S. John's, Cheltenham, during Lent 1843. Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d. cloth.

CARTER'S PSALTER; containing a selection of Psalm Tunes, Chaunts, Services, and other Ecclesiastical Music, with Psalms appointed for every Sunday, Vigil, and Holy Day throughout the year. The Psalms selected as appropriate to each day, from the New Version of the Psalms of David, authorised to be sung in churches. By the Rev. Wm. J. E. Bennett, M.A., late Student of Ch: Ch: Oxford. Incumbent of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge. The Music arranged for congregational singing, in four parts, with an accompaniment for the organ or piano-forte, by the late Robert Carter, Organist of S. Paul's Church, Knightsbridge, price £1 2s. in cloth.

A DISCOURSE OF THE RIGHT OF THE CHURCH IN A CHRISTIAN STATE; by Herbert Thorndike, B.D. Formerly Prebendary of Westminster. Originally printed in 1649. A new edition, with an Appendix, General Index, &c., and Preface, by the Rev. J. S. Brewer, M.A., of Queen's College, Oxford; Classical Tutor of King's College, London, 12mo. cloth boards, reduced to 4s.

MOSHEIM'S INSTITUTES OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, Ancient and Modern. A new and literal Translation from the Original Latin, and copious additional Notes, original and selected; by Thomas Murdock, D.D. Edited, with additional Notes, by Henry Soames, M.A., Rector of Stapleford, Tawney, with Thoydon Mount, Essex. A new and revised edition, 4 vols. 8vo. cloth, £2 8s.

SIX SERMONS on the Temptation of Christ in the Wilderness; by the Rev. Edward Scobell, M.A. Incumbent of S. Peter's, Vere Street. 12mo. cloth, 4s.

By the same Author,

PSALMS AND HYMNS selected and adapted to the Purposes of Public Worship. 18mo. cloth, 2s. Fifth edition.

WILSON'S ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE DOCTRINE AND DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH, from the Apostolical Fathers, S. Clement of Rome, S. Ignatius, and S. Polycarp; by Charles Thomas Wilson, M.A., Curate of the Parish of Liverpool. 12mo. price 4s. cloth.

In 1 vol. post 8vo. cloth,

THE PSALMS, from the Version used in the Services of the Church of England, with Notes, shewing their Prophetic and Christian character; by the Rev. William Hill Tucker, A.M., Rector of Dunton Waylett, Essex.

SHORT REASONS FOR BELIEF IN THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST. By a Lady of Title. 1 vol. 18mo. cloth, 2s. 6d.

HUTCHINSON'S PLAIN SERMONS on the Church Ministry and Sacraments; by the Rev. Cyril Hutchinson, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Rector of Batsford, Gloucestershire. Foolscap 8vo. price 4s. 6d. boards.

BISHOP OF JAMAICA'S CHARGE, delivered at the Primary Visitation of the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Jamaica, in the Cathedral Church of S. Jago de la Vega, 12th December, 1844. By Aubrey George, Lord Bishop of Jamaica. 8vo. cloth limp, 2s. sewed 1s. 6d.

MOORE'S UNIVERSITY SERMONS. Four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in December, 1844; by Daniel Moore, M.A., of Catherine Hall, and Perpetual Curate of Camden Chapel, Camberwell. 8vo. cloth, price 4s.

In 1 vol. square 16mo. with 4 plates, price 2s. 6d. cloth, second edition of the

COTTAGE ON THE COMMON, The Little Gleaners, &c. &c. By C. M., Author of "Rhoda," "Child and Hermit," "The Tent," &c.

In 1 vol. demy 8vo. price 2s. 6d. cloth,

MITHRIDATES; or, Mr. Newman's Essay on Development its own Confutation. By a Quondam Disciple, containing an Introduction on the present aspect of the Controversy with Rome, and the real moving cause of the late Secession. Chapter I, on Development and the contradictory definitions of it; Chapter II, on Ideas and the application of the term to Christianity; Chapter III, on the recognition of the principles of Development by the Anglican Church, and on Vincentius's rule; Chapter IV, on Romish Developments. Conclusion, on the possibility of proving the Historical truth of Lutheranism by Mr. Newman's Theory of Development.

AMBROSE WARD; or, The Dissenter Reclaimed. A Tale for the Times. Foolscap 8vo. cloth, 4s. 6d.

HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES OF MELBOURN CHURCH, Derbyshire; by the Rev. Joseph Deans, M.A., Vicar of Melbourn, Perpetual Curate of Chellaston, Derbyshire, and Domestic Chaplain to the Right Honourable the Earl of Beverly. 8vo. with plates by Gray, price 5s. cloth.

A FORM OF PRAYER FOR THE CHURCH UNDER HER PRESENT DISTRESS. Price One Penny, or 5s. per 100.

A PRAYER OF FAITH. From Bishop Andrewes. Price one Penny, or 7s. per 100. On a Card for distribution.

RECIPROCAL DUTIES BETWEEN A MINISTER AND HIS PEOPLE. A Sermon preached in the Church of S. Leonard's-on-Sea, on Sexagesima Sunday 1842; by the Rev. James Murray, M.A., of S. John's College, Oxford; Incumbent of S. Andrewes, Wells Street; Chaplain to her Grace the Dowager Duchess of Beaufort, and the Right Hon. the Earl of Donoughmore.

By the same Author,

NATIONAL EDUCATION. A Sermon preached in the Church of S. Leonard's-on-Sea, on Sunday, 23rd October, 1842, for the S. Leonard's National School. 8vo. 9d. Also,

A LETTER to a Member of the Committee of the London City Mission, on the Schismatical proceedings of that Society, in the District of All Soul's, S. Marylebone; in 8vo. price 6d. And,

A Statement in Support of the above Letter. 8vo. price 6d.

BEAUFORT'S (Rev. D. A.) CUSTOMS OF THE CHURCH. A Sermon, preached in Portman Chapel, S. Marylebone, on Sunday the 1st of January, 1843, upon making certain changes consequent upon the Bishop's Charge. Price 6d.

By the same Author,

SCRIPTURE SUFFICIENT WITHOUT TRADITION; or, The Doctrine of the Sixth Article of the British Church maintained. An Essay which obtained the Norrisian Gold Medal for the year 1840, in the University of Cambridge. Demy 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

BIRD ON THE DECALOGUE.—The Law, a Rule of Life to the Christian; considered in Eleven Lectures, preached in the Parish Church of Gainsborough, during Lent, 1844; by the Rev. Charles Smith Bird, M.A., F.L.S., Vicar of Gainsborough, and Prebendary of Lincoln, late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Fcap. 8vo. price 4s. 6d. cloth.

By the same Author,

LENT LECTURES. The Use of the Catechism, The Baptismal Vow, and The Means of Grace, considered in Twelve Lectures, preached in Lent 1841. Fcap. 8vo. price 3s. 6d. cloth.

THE GOOD WAY IS THE OLD WAY; or, The Love of Novelty in Religion Censured. A Sermon; by the Rev. Alfred Williams, M.A. 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

BEST'S (Hon. and Rev. Samuel) PIETAS DOMESTICA.

1 vol. 12mo. price 6s. 6d. cloth.

Part 1. FAMILY PRAYERS, arranged as a weekly course from the Liturgy.

Part 2. DISCOURSES on the SERVICES, appointed by the Liturgy for Sundays and Holy Days; or separately, thus:

FAMILY PRAYERS, 1 vol. price 2s.

COMPANION TO FAMILY PRAYER, 1 vol. 5s. cloth.

PAROCHIAL MINISTRATION. 12mo. price 3s. 6d.

PAROCHIAL SERMONS. 12mo. price 3s. 6d.

ELEMENTARY GRAMMAR. For the use of Village Schools, 2d.

WAYS OF OVERCOMING TEMPTATION; with a Form of Self-Examination and Prayers. By the Rev. George Boodle, M.A., Vicar of Compton Dando, Somerset. A new edition, 12mo. price 4d.

Second Edition, in fcap. 8vo. price 6s. cloth boards,

THE ROUND PREACHER; or, Reminiscences of Methodist Circuit Life; by an Ex-Wesleyan.

In 1 vol. post 8vo. cloth, price 6s.

SAUL, A MYSTERY; by the Author of "Christian Ballads," &c.&c.

WILMOT'S MIDSHIPMAN'S FRIEND; or, Hints for the Cockpit: by Arthur Parry Eardley Wilmot, Captain Royal Navy. Fcap. 8vo. 3s. 6d. cloth, second edition.

BROUGHAM *versus* BROUGHAM, On the New Poor Law; in Five Letters to the Editor of the *Morning Post;* First Published in that Paper; with an Appendix, comprising a Letter to Lord John Russell. Dedicated to the Duke of Wellington; by Richard Oastler.

In 1 vol. demy 8vo. price 1s. 6d. limp cloth,

GUIDE TO THE HUSTINGS—Cleaver's Parliamentary Elections' Register. For ascertaining the Results of any General Election, or the State of Parties, as represented in the House of Commons, at any period during the continuance of any existing Parliament. Fcap. 8vo. cloth, 4s. 6d.

"It is in all respects admirably arranged, and never out of date."—*Atlas.*

"The idea of the book is excellent."—*Hull Advertiser.*

"This is a useful guide and memorandum."—*Bell's Weekly Messenger.*

"It is a most useful publication, and ought to be in the hands of every parliamentary gentleman."—*Newcastle Journal.*

"Admirably adapted to its intended purpose."—*Evening Paper.*

TRIBUTE TO HYDROPATHY; or, A Few Practical Hints to Invalids who are desirous of getting well without Medicine. Being a Short Account of the treatment pursued at Stanstead Bury; by Sir John E. Eardley Wilmot, Bart., Barrister-at-law. Second edition, with considerable additions. Price 1s. 6d.

HIPPISLEY'S SIEGE OF BARCELONA, A Poem in Three Cantos; by Lieut.-Col. Gustavus Butler Hippisley. Fcap. 8vo. price 5s. cloth.

RANDALL'S (Miss E.) ADELE. A Tale of the French Revolution. Small 8vo. 7s. 6d. boards.

THE TONGUE. In two parts; by Alexander Bell, Esq., Professor of Elocution.

"This Poem, written in very good blank verse, treats of the Tongue and its functions. A moment's reflection, and the reader will perceive what an interesting subject the tongue might be made in the hands of an ingenious poet. What scope it affords for allusion; and how many topics might be brought in ancillary to it. Mr. Bell has been aware of this, and has succeeded in producing a polished, amusing, and instructing poem."—*Bell's Life.*

By the same Author, in demy 8vo.

THE BRIDE. A Play in Five Acts; by Alexander Bell, Esq. Professor of Elocution, and Author of the "Tongue," &c. &c. price 3s.

THE PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN'S LIBRARY.

A SERIES OF CHEAP PUBLICATIONS, FOR GENERAL CIRCULATION.

	s.	d.
1. Learn to die.—(Sutton) . .	1	0
2. Practice of Divine Love.—(Ken.)	0	9
3. Private Devotions. (Spinckes)	1	6
4. Parable of the Pilgrim.—(Patrick)	1	0
5. The Imitation of Christ.—(à Kempis)	1	0
6. Manual of Prayer for the Young.—(Ken.)	0	6
7. Guide to the Holy Communion.—(Nelson)	0	8
8. Guide to the Penitent.—(Kettlewell)	0	9
9. The Golden Grove. (Taylor)	0	9
10. Daily Exercises.—(Horneck)	0	9
11. Life of Ambrose Bonwicke .	1	0
12. Plain Sermons.—(Andrewes)	2	0
13. Life of Bishop Bull. (Nelson)	1	6
14. Death, Judgment, Heaven, and Hell.—(Bp. Taylor) .	0	9
15. Companion to the Prayer Book	1	0
16. Christian Contentment.—(Sanderson)	0	9
17. Steps to the Altar	0	9
18. Selections from Hooker.—(Keble)	1	6
19. Advice to a Friend. (Patrick)	1	6
20. Repentance and Fasting.—(Patrick)	1	6
21. On Prayer.—(Patrick) . .	2	0
22. Practical Christian, Part I. (Sherlock)	2	0
23. ——— Part II. (Sherlock)	2	0
24. Meditations on the Eucharist.—(Sutton)	2	0
25. Learn to Live.—(Sutton) .	2	0
26. The Art of Contentment, by the author of "The Whole Duty of Man"	1	6
27. Meditations for a Fortnight.—(Gerhard)	0	6
28. The Heart's Ease. (Patrick)	1	6
29. Doctrine of the English Church.—(Heylin) . . .	0	8
30. Manual for Confirmation and first Communion	0	8
31. Hymns for Public and Private Use	2	0
32. The Seven Penitential Psalms	1	0
33. Cosin's Devotions	1	0
34. Holy Living.—(Bp. Taylor)	2	0
35. Holy Dying.—(Bp. Taylor)	2	0
36. St. Augustine's Confessions	2	0

CHEAP BOOKS FOR PAROCHIAL USE.

	s.	d.
Berens' History of the Prayer Book	3	6
Beveridge's Sermons on the Church	2	0
Beveridge on the Catechism .	1	6
Cotton's Explanation of Obsolete Words in the Bible . . .	0	6
Hammond's Paræsis, with a Discourse of Heresy in Defence of our Church against the Romanist	1	6
Henshaw's Meditations, Miscellaneous, Holy, and Humane	1	0
Laud's Speeches on the Liturgy, &c.	2	0
Le Mesurier's Prayers for the Sick	3	0
Scandret's Sacrifice the Divine Service	1	6
Sherlock on the Catechism . .	0	6
Sparrow's Rationale on the Book of Common Prayer	2	6
Spelman's Rights of Churches	1	6
The Seven Penitential Psalms .	0	2
Vincent of Lerins against Heresy	1	6
Wilson's Sacra Privata (entire)	1	6
Wilson on the Lord's Supper, (ungarbled edition) . . .	1	0
Winslow's Remains, or the Catholic Churchman in his Life and Death	4	0
Wither's Hymns of the Church	2	0
——— Select Hymns . . .	1	0

A CATALOGUE OF BOOKS

IN THE VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS OF LITERATURE,

ON SALE,

BEING A SELECTION FROM THE STOCK OF

W. J. CLEAVER,

BAKER STREET, PORTMAN SQUARE, LONDON.

The whole are warranted perfect, are in good Condition, and are now offered at the affixed low prices.

ANGLER'S Souvenir, by Fisher, fcap. 8vo., embellished with upwards of 60 beautiful engravings on steel by Beckwith and Topham, and hundreds of engraved borders, every page being surrounded by appropriate woodcut devices, gilt cloth, 8s. 6d. published at 18s. *Tilt*, 1835

ANGLING. The British Angler's Manual, or the Art of Angling, by T. C. Hofland, Esq., with numerous engravings, 8vo. cloth, 12s *London*, 1839

—— The Illustrated Fly-Fisher's Text Book, a complete guide to the science of Trout and Salmon Fishing, by Theophilus South, 23 beautiful engravings on steel, after paintings by Cooper, Newton, Fielding, Lee, and others, 8vo. extra green cloth, 9s. 6d., published at £1 11s. 6d. 1845

—— Walton's and Cotton's Complete Angler, edited by Major, with portraits and numerous beautiful plates, 12mo. cloth, uncut, 12s.

———— Another copy, beautifully bound in morocco, extra gilt edges, 16s 1844

ARABIAN NIGHTS (Lane's beautiful edition), with very copious Notes, illustrative of the Language, Manners, and Customs of the Egyptian Arabs, illustrated by upwards of 1000 beautiful wood engravings by the most eminent Artists, after designs by W. Harvey and others, 3 vols. imperial 8vo. in extra cloth, £2 2s., published at £4 4s. 1840

BIBLE (The Holy), Cabinet Pictorial Edition, with Notes, by the Rev. Hobart Caunter, embellished with 145 fine wood engravings by Westall and Martin, also several maps, medium 8vo. cloth, full gilt back and sides, published at £1 11s. 6d., reduced to 10s. 6d.

—— the same, calf gilt, or embossed roan, gilt edges, published at £1 16s. reduced to 14s.

—— the same, morocco, super extra, richly gilt, published at £2 5s. reduced to £1.

—— Pictorial Edition, containing upwards of 800 woodcuts and illustrations, with notes, &c. 3 vols. 8vo. morocco, very handsomely bound, £5 5s. *Knight, London*, 1836

———— with notes, many hundred illustrations, 4 vols. 4to. morocco elegant *ibid.* 1838.

BEWICK'S Select Fables, with a Memoir and descriptive Catalogue of the Works of Messrs. Bewick, 8vo. with several portraits of Bewick, and upwards of 350 engravings on wood, original impressions, boards, published at 15s. reduced to 10s. *Newcastle*, 1820

—— the same, royal 8vo. large paper, boards, published at £1 1s. reduced to 12s.

—— the same, imperial 8vo. largest paper, bds. pub. at £1 11s. 6d. reduced to £1 1s.

BEWICK'S Edition of Æsop's Fables, 8vo. with upwards of 350 fine woodcuts, bds. published at 18s. reduced to 12s. *Newcastle*, 1818

—— the same, imperial 8vo. largest paper, bds. published at £2 2s. reduced to £1 11s. 6d.

—— Large Woodcuts, viz. Portrait, Lion, Tiger, Elephant, and Zebra, struck off on 4to. paper, published at £1 5s. reduced to 7s. 6d.

—— the same, on India paper, published at £2 10s. reduced to 15s.

—— the same, on vellum, published at £5 reduced to £1 10s.

"The matchless, inimitable Bewick. The delight of childhood, manhood, decaying age!—a moral in every tail-piece—a sermon in every vignette."—Prof. Wilson in *Blackwood's Magazine*.

BOOK OF GEMS, or the Modern Poets and Artists of Great Britain, 8vo. 50 exquisitely beautiful line engravings, after Turner, Bonington, &c. &c. cloth, elegantly gilt, published at £1 11s. 6d. reduced to 15s. 1844

—— or in morocco extra, £1 1s.

BROWN'S Book of British Butterflies, Sphinges, and Moths, complete in 3 vols. 18mo. illustrated by 144 coloured plates, in extra red cloth, richly gilt, published at 15s. reduced to 7s. 6d. 1834

BOSWELL'S Life of Dr. Samuel Johnson, incorporating the Journal of his Tour to the Hebrides, and accompanied by the Commentaries of all preceding Editors, with numerous additional notes and illustrative anecdotes, by the Right Hon. John Wilson Croker; to which are added, two supplementary volumes of Anecdotes, by Hawkins, Piozzi, Murphy, Tyers, Reynolds, Steevens, and others, 10 vols. 12mo. illustrated by upwards of 50 views, portraits, and sheets of autographs, finely engraved on steel, from drawings by Sir J. Reynolds, Stanfield, Harding, &c. of which illustrations above 30 are now first added, bound in extra cloth, lettered in gold, reduced to £1 15s. 1846

—— the same, half-bound morocco, £2 16s.

BOUTELL'S (Rev. Charles) Monumental Brasses and Slabs; an Historical and descriptive notice of the incised monumental memorials of the Middle Ages, with numerous illustrations, 1 vol. royal 8vo, cloth, price 10s. 6d.

BLAIR'S (Dr. Hugh) Sermons, to which is prefixed a short account of the Life and Character of the Author, by James Finlayson, D.D. A new edition, in 5 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £3. reduced to 14s. 1807

BROCKEDON'S Hand Book for Travellers from London to Naples, illustrated with engravings by W. and E. Finden, 1 vol. imperial 8vo. cloth, published at £1 11s. 6d. reduced to 10s. 6d.

—— Illustrations of the Passes of the Alps, by which Italy communicates with France, Switzerland, and Germany, 2 vols. 4to. half-bound morocco, published at £7 10s. reduced to £3 3s. 1828

BUCK'S (Rev. Charles) Theological Dictionary, containing Definitions of all Religious and Ecclesiastical Terms; a comprehensive view of every article in the system of Divinity; an impartial account of all the principal Denominations which have subsisted in the Religious World from the birth of Christ to the present day, &c. &c. A new and greatly enlarged edition, by the Rev. Dr. Henderson, Theological Tutor of Highbury College; published at 18s. reduced to 14s. cloth.

BURTON'S Anatomy of Melancholy; what it is, with all the kinds, causes, and symptoms, prognostics, and several cures of it; in three partitions, with their several sections, members, and subsections, philosophically, medicinally, historically opened and cut up; in 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £1 4s. reduced to 13s.

BURNS' (Robert) Complete Poetical and Prose Works, including his Reliques, with an Account of his Life and Writings, and some observations

on the Character and Condition of the Scottish Peasantry, by James Currie, M.D., F.R.S., new edition, with considerable additions, including further particulars of the Author's Life, and new notes, illustrative of his Poems and Letters, by his brother, Gilbert Burns, 5 vols. 8vo. illustrated with fine portrait by Nasmyth, fac-simile of his hand-writing, and 16 beautiful engravings after the designs of Thos. Stothard, extra gilt cloth, published at £3 13s. 6d. reduced to £1 5s. 1820

BURNS' Works, complete, with Life by Allan Cunningham, and Notes by Sir Walter Scott, Campbell, Wordsworth, Lockhart, &c. royal 8vo. fine portrait and plates, cloth lettered, uniform with Byron, published at 18s. reduced to 10s. 6d. 1842

—— the same, morocco, extra, full gilt, £1.

THE BRIDGEWATER TREATISES—COMPLETE :—

		£	s.	d.
1.	By the Rev. Dr. Chalmers—On the Power, Wisdom, and Goodness of God, as manifested in the Adaptation of External Nature to the Moral and Intellectual Constitution of Man. 2 vols. 8vo. 16s.	0	16	0
2.	By Dr. John Kidd—The Adaptation of External Nature to the Physical Condition of Man. 8vo.	0	9	6
3.	By the Rev. W. Whewell—Astronomy and General Physics considered with reference to Natural Theology. 8vo.	0	9	6
	fcap. 8vo.	0	6	0
4.	By Sir Charles Bell—The Hand, its Mechanism and Vital Endowments, as evincing design. 8vo. with numerous woodcuts	0	10	6
5.	By Dr. P. M. Roget—Animal and Vegetable Physiology considered with reference to Natural Theology, 2 vols. 8vo.	1	10	0
6.	By the Rev. Dr. Buckland—On Geology and Mineralogy, with 80 plates, 2 vols. 8vo.	1	15	0
	The Supplementary Notes, and additional Plate to the First Edition, may be had separate, price 1s. 6d.			
7.	By the Rev. W. Kirby—On the History, Habits, and Instincts of Animals. 2 vols. 8vo. plates	1	10	0
8.	By Dr. W. Prout—Chemistry, Meteorology, and the Function of Digestion, considered with reference to Natural Theology. 8vo.	0	15	0

CALMET'S Dictionary of the Bible, with the Biblical Fragments, by the late Charles Taylor, 5 vols. 4to. illustrated by 202 copper-plate engravings, eighth greatly enlarged edition, beautifully printed on fine wove paper, strongly bound in gilt cloth, published at £10 10s. reduced to £5 5s. 1840

—— Dictionary of the Holy Bible, abridged, 1 large vol. impl. 8vo. wood-cuts and maps, extra cloth, £1. 1845

CAMPBELL'S (Dr.) Dissertation on the Miracles, with his Sermons and Tracts; and an Examination of the Principles advanced by David Hume, Esq.; also a Correspondence on the subject by Hume, Campbell, and Blair. 8vo. cloth extra, published at 10s. 6d. reduced to 3s. 6d. 1823

—— Works, in 6 vols. 8vo. cloth, pub. at £2 2s. reduced to £1 14s.

CARY'S Testimonies of the Fathers of the first Four Centuries, to the Constitution and Doctrines of the Church of England, as set forth in the Thirty-nine Articles. 8vo. extra cloth, published at 12s. reduced to 7s. 6d.
Oxford, Talboys.

"This work may be classed with those of Pearson and Bishop Bull; and such a classification is not a mean honour."—*Church of England Quarterly.*

CHALMERS (A.) The British Essayists, with Prefaces Historical and Biographical, by A. Chalmers, F.S.A. 38 vols. 12mo. boards, £3 13s. 6d.
London, 1823

CHARNOCK'S Discourses upon the Existence and Attributes of God, complete in one thick closely-printed volume, 8vo. with portrait, extra cloth boards, published at 14s. reduced to 7s. 6d. 1845

CHATTERTON'S Works, both Prose and Poetical, including his Letters, with Notices of his Life, History of the Rowley Controversy, and Notes Critical and Explanatory. 2 vols. post 8vo. elegantly printed, with engraved Fac-similes of Chatterton's hand-writing and the Rowley MSS. cloth lettered, published at 15s. reduced to 9s. 1842

—— Large Paper, 2 vols. crown 8vo. extra cloth, boards, published at £1 1s. reduced to 12s.

CICERONI'S Opera ex editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti, sedula recension accurata. Accesserunt incerti Auctoris Rhetorica ad Herennium. Beautifully printed, in 12 vols. 16mo. cloth, £1 5s.

CLARKE'S (Dr. E. D.) Travels in various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa, particularly Russia, Tartary, Turkey, Greece, Egypt, the Holy Land, and Scandinavia, 11 vols. 8vo. maps and plates, extra cloth boards, pub. at £10. reduced to £3 3s. 1827—34

COLLIER'S (Jeremy) Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, chiefly of England, from the first planting of Christianity, to the end of the Reign of King Charles II.; with a brief account of the affairs of Religion in Ireland. New edition, with a Life of the Author; the Controversial Tracts connected with the History, and an enlarged Index, in 9 vols. 8vo. cloth, £4 14s. 6d. 1845

COOKE'S Shipping and Craft, a series of 65 brilliant Etchings, comprising Picturesque but at the same time extremely accurate representations of the principal varieties of Shipping and Craft met with in the British Seas and Rivers, from a Thames Wherry to a first-rate Man-of-War, royal 4to. elegantly bound in gilt cloth, published at £3 13s. 6d. reduced to £1 11s. 6d.

—— the same, India proofs, impl. 4to. half-bound morocco, gilt edges, published at £5 5s. reduced to £3 3s.

COOKE'S London and its Vicinity, 50 beautiful Etchings, after drawings by Calcott, Stanfield, Prout, Roberts, Harding, Stark, Havell, and Cotman, royal 4to. gilt cloth, published at £5. reduced to £1 11s. 6d.

—— imperial 4to. India proofs, half-bound morocco, published at £6 16s. 6d. reduced to £3 3s.

COOKE'S Thames Scenery, 75 fine plates, proof impressions, small folio, with the 8vo. vol. of letter-press, 2 vols. half-bound morocco extra, pub. at £10 10s. reduced to £2 12s. 6d.

—— the same, India proof impressions, small folio, with the 8vo. vol. of letter-press, 2 vols. half-bound morocco extra, published at £15 15s. reduced to £3 3s.

COWPER'S Life and Works, by Grimshaw, 8 vols. foolscap 8vo. cloth, published at £2. reduced to £1 10s.

—— the same, handsomely bound in calf, extra full gilt backs £3.

CRANMER'S (Archbishop) Life, by the Rev. Henry John Todd, M.A. in 2 vols. 8vo. boards, published at £1 6s. reduced to 9s.

CRUDEN'S (Alexander) Complete Concordance to the Old and New Testaments, to which is added a Concordance to the Apocrypha, with a Compendium of the Bible, and a brief account of its History and excellency, with a life of the Author, by William Youngman. 1 vol. imperial 8vo. cloth, reduced to 12s.

DAILLE'S Treatise on the Right Use of the Fathers, in the Decision of Controversies existing in Religion. Translated from the French and revised by the Rev. T. Smith. Now re-edited and amended, with a Preface, by the Rev. G. Jekyll, 8vo. extra cloth boards, pub. at 7s. 6d. reduced to 5s. 1843

DE FOE'S (Daniel) Novels and Miscellaneous Works, with a Biographical Memoir of the Author, Literary Prefaces to the various pieces, illustrative Notes, &c., including all contained in the edition attributed to Sir Walter Scott, with considerable additions. 20 vols. fcap. 8vo. new and uncut, in cloth, published at £5. reduced to £4 4s.

DIBDIN'S (Charles) Songs, chronologically arranged, with Notes, historical, biographical, and critical, and the Music of the best and most popular of the Melodies, with new Pianoforte Accompaniments; to which is prefixed a Memoir of the Author, portrait. 1 thick vol. royal 8vo. cloth lettered, 13s. 6d. published at £1 4s. 1814

DIBDIN'S Bibliomania, or Book-Madness, a Bibliographical Romance, new edition, with considerable additions, including a key to the assumed Characters in the Drama, and a supplement, royal 8vo. 2 vols. handsomely printed, embellished by numerous wood-cuts, many of which are now first added, extra cloth boards, published at £3 3s. reduced to £1 11s. 6d. 1842

DIBDIN'S (Rev. T. F.) Sunday Library, being a selection of Sermons from eminent Divines of the Church of England, chiefly within the last half century; with occasional Biographical Sketches and Notes. New edition, 6 vols. small 8vo. cloth, published at £1 10s. reduced to 18s.

DIBDIN'S (T. F.) Introduction to the Knowledge of Rare and Valuable Editions of the Greek and Latin Classics: together with an Account of Polyglott Bibles, Polyglott Psalters, Hebrew Bibles, Greek Bibles, and Greek Testaments, the Greek Fathers, and the Latin Fathers. Fourth edition, greatly enlarged and corrected, 2 vols. 8vo., published at £2 2s., reduced to 14s.

D'OYLY & MANT'S.—The Holy Bible, according to the Authorized Version; with Notes, Explanatory and Practical; taken principally from the most Eminent Writers of the United Church of England and Ireland, together with appropriate Introductions, Tables, Indexes, Maps, and Plans. 4 vols. 4to. in good condition, bound neatly in calf, £3 3s. 1817.

——— a very fine Copy of THE SAME, in 3 vols. half-bound neatly in calf, price £4 14s. 6d. 1817

FOX'S (John) Acts and Monuments. A new and complete edition, with a Preliminary Dissertation, by the Rev. George Townsend, M.A. of Trin. Coll. Cambridge; edited by the Rev. Stephen Reed Cattley M.A. of Queen's Coll. Cambridge. 8 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £4 16s., reduced to £3 10s.

FROISSART'S (Sir John) Chronicles of England, France, Spain, and the adjoining Countries, from the latter part of the reign of Edward the 2nd, to the Coronation of Henry the 4th; translated from the French edition, with Variations and Additions from many celebrated MSS. By Thomas Johnnes, Esq. To which are prefixed a Life of the Author, an Essay on his Works, and a Criticism on his History, in 2 vols. royal 8vo. cloth, £1 16s.

GILPIN'S Works on the Picturesque in Landscape scenery and Gardening, viz. 1. Northern Tour—2. Southern Tour—3. Western Tour—4. Eastern Tour—5. Scottish Tour—6. River Wye—7. Forest Scenery—8. Five Essays—9. Essay on Prints, Picturesque Travel, Landscape Painting, &c.—together 12 vols. 8vo. with 187 acquatinta engravings, bds. published at £10 10s., reduced to £3 3s. 1808, &c.

GOLOWNIN'S (Captain) Memoirs of Japan, during 1811, 1812, and 1813, with Observations on the Country and the People, second edition, 3 vols. 8vo. extra cloth bds., published at £1 11s. 6d., reduced to 10s. 6d. 1824.

GORTON'S (John) Topographical Dictionary of Great Britain and Ireland. Compiled from local information and the most recent and official authorities. By John Gorton and G. N. Wright, in 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, with Hall's Atlas (colored) £2 12s. 6d. *London*, 1833.

GIBBON'S History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. For the Use of Families and Young Persons, re-printed from the Original Text, with the careful omission of all passages of an irreligious and immoral tendency. By Thomas Bowdler, Esq. Editor of the "Family Shakspeare." 5 vols. 8vo. bds., published at £3 3s., reduced to £1.

HEBER'S (Bishop) Narrative, with Letters written in India. 3 vols. 8vo. calf, marble leaves, £2.

——— Memoirs and Correspondence: edited by his Widow, with Selections from his Unpublished Poems and Papers; with a Journal of his Tour in Northern Europe, and a History of the Cossacks. 2 vols. 4to. cloth, 17s.

HEDERICI LEXICON GRÆCUM, by Larcher. 4to. bds., published at £1 14s., reduced to 13s.

HONE'S (William) Every-Day Book, and Table Book, and Year's Book. 4 vols. 8vo. cloth, uncut, and perfectly new, published at £2 16s., reduced to £1 11s. 6d.

HOOK'S (N.) Roman History, from the Building of Rome, to the Ruin of the Commonwealth. 6 vols. 8vo. calf extra, Maps, £2 12s. 6d.

HORNE'S (Bishop) Works, to which are prefixed Memoirs of his Life, Studies, and Writings, by William Jones, M.A., one of his Lordship's Chaplains. 4 vols. 8vo. bds., published at £2 2s., reduced to £1 11s. 6d. (Scarce.)

HORNE'S (T. Hartwell) Introduction to the Critical Study of the Bible. 5 vols. 8vo. bds., published at £3 3s., reduced to £2 10s.

HUME AND SMOLLETT'S History of England, with the last Corrections and Improvements of the Authors, and a Memoir of Hume, written by himself, complete in one large vol. impl. 8vo., fine portraits of the authors, extra cloth bds., reduced to £1 1s. 1840.

HURD'S (Bishop) Works in 8 vols. 8vo. cloth, uncut, published at £3 12s., reduced to 15s.

HUSKISSON'S (Wm.) Speeches, with a Biographical Memoir, supplied to the Editor from Authentic Sources. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, uncut, published at £2 2s., reduced to 18s.

ILLUSTRATED COMMENTARY ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS; being a republication of the Notes of the Pictorial Bible. 5 vols. post 8vo. cloth, £1 10s.

JARDINE'S Naturalist's Library, 40 vols. 12mo. coloured plates, cloth lettered, published at 6s. per vol., reduced to 5s. 1834-43.

1. Humming Birds, Vol. 1.
2. Monkeys.
3. Humming Birds, Vol. 2.
4. Lions, Tigers, &c.
5. Peacocks, Pheasants, &c.
6. Birds of the Game kind.
7. Fishes, Vol. 1.
8. Coleoptorous Insects (Beetles).
9. Columbidæ (Pigeons).
10. British Diurnal Lepidoptera (Butterflies).
11. Ruminating Animals (Deer, Antelopes, &c.)
12. Ruminating Animals (Goats, Sheep, Cattle, &c.)
13. Pachidermata (Elephants, Rhinoceroses, &c.)
14. British Nocturnal Lepidoptera (Moths, Sphinxes, &c.)
15. Parrots.
16. Whales.
17. Birds of Western Africa, Vol. 1.
18. Foreign Butterflies.
19. Birds of Western Africa, Vol. 2.
20. British Birds, Vol. 1.
21. Fly Catchers.
22. British Quadrupeds.
23. Amphibious Carnivora (Walrus, Seals, &c.)
24. British Birds, Vol. 2.
25. Dogs, Vol. 1.
26. Honey Bees.
27. Fishes, Vol. 2.
28. Dogs, Vol. 2.
29. Introduction to Entomology.
30. Marsupialia, or pouched Animals.
31. Horses.
32. Fishes of Guiana, Vol. 1.
33. Foreign Moths.
34. British Birds, Vol. 3.
35. Introduction to Mammalia.
36. Sun Birds.
37. British Fishes, Vol. 1.
38. Fishes of Guiana, Vol. 2.
39. British Fishes, Vol. 2.
40. British Birds, Vol. 4.

LANE'S (E. W.) Arabian Nights, Pictorial Edition; a new and improved translation, with very copious Notes, illustrative of the Language, Manners, and Customs of the Egyptian Arabs, by E. W. Lane, Esq. many years resident in Arabia and Egypt, 3 vols. impl. 8vo. upwards of 1000 beautiful wood engravings of Architecture, Costume, and Scenery, by the most eminent artists, after designs by W. Harvey and others, bound in richly gilt cloth, published at £4 4s., reduced to £2 12s. 6d.

——— the same, 3 vols, impl. 8vo. richly bound in green morocco, gilt edges, £4 4s. 1840.

"This book is the most complete manual of Eastern manners ever published. Mr. Lane has availed himself of numerous manuscripts brought from Egypt, to perfect many tales which had been either garbled or abridged by former translations. These valuable notes throw more light on the mystery of Arab life than perhaps all other works in our language."—*Athenæum.*

——— Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, a new and enlarged edition, with great improvements, 2 vols. 8vo., numerous woodcuts, printed to match Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians, cloth, richly gilt backs, published at £1 8s., reduced to 18s. 1842.

LARDNER'S (Dr. Nathaniel) Works, containing Credibility of the Gospel History, Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, History of Heretics, and Sermons and Tracts, with Life of the Author, by Dr. Kippis. 10 vols. 8vo. best edition, extra cloth lettered, published at £5 5s., reduced to £4 4s. 1838.

LAUDER'S (Sir Thomas Dick) Memorial of the Royal Progresses in Scotland in 1842. a thick and splendid vol. 4to. embellished with 50 most beautiful engravings on steel and wood by the first artists, elegantly bound in gilt cloth, (published by Royal Authority) published at £2 2s., reduced to £1 10s. *Edinburgh*, 1843.

——— the same, large paper, royal 4to. India proofs, (very few printed) gilt cloth, published at £4 4s., reduced to £1 16s.

LEAKE'S (Col.) Travels in the Morea, 3 vols. 8vo., with a very large map of the Morea, and upwards of 30 various maps, plans, plates of ancient Greek Inscriptions, &c. extra cloth bds., published at £2 5s., reduced to £1 8s. 1830.

This extremely valuable book has long been considered out of print and very scarce, and in consequence has of late sold for more than the full price. A few copies having by accident been reserved in the publisher's warehouse, and purchased by the advertiser, they are now submitted at a reduced instead of an advanced price, and attention is respectfully called to the present opportunity as the stock cannot last long.

——— Researches in Greece, with a Comparative View of its Ancient and Modern Geography, Observations on Ancient Monuments of Art, and on the Languages and Dialects of Greece, including Vocabularies of the Albanian, Modern Greek, Wallachian, Bulgarian, and Albanian Grammar, &c. royal 4to. bd. in cloth, lettered, published at £3 3s., reduced to £1 7s.

LEIGHTON'S (Archbishop) Whole Works: to which is prefixed a Life of the Author, by the Rev. T. N. Pearson. New Edition, 2 thick vols. 8vo. portrait, extra cloth, published at £1 4s., reduced to 16s. 1841.

THE ONLY COMPLETE EDITION.

——— Commentary on S. Peter; with Life by Pearson, complete, in one thick handsomely printed vol. 8vo. portrait, extra cloth, published at 12s., reduced to 9s. 1846.

LE KEUX—Memorials of Cambridge: a Series of Views of the Colleges, Halls, and Public Buildings; with Historical and Descriptive Accounts, by Wright and Jones. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, reduced to 21s.

LISTER'S (T. H.) Life and Correspondence of Edward, First Earl of Clarendon, with Original Correspondence and Authentic Papers, never before published. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £2 8s. reduced to £1.

LOCKHART'S (J. G.) Ancient Spanish Ballads, Historical and Romantic. A new edition revised, with numerous illustrations, from drawings by Allan, Roberts, Simson, Warren, Aubrey, and Harvey; and with ornamental title, borders, and Vignettes. 1 vol. super. cloth gilt, small 4to. £1 18s.

LUTHER'S Commentary on the Psalms of Degrees, to which is prefixed a copious Historical Account of Monastic Life in England. 8vo. plate of monastic habits, cloth lettered, published at 10s. 6d. reduced to 5s. 1819

MACCULLOCH'S (John) Proofs and Illustrations of the Attributes of God, from the Facts and Laws of the Physical Universe, being the Foundation of Natural and Revealed Religion. 3 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £1. 16s., reduced to £1. 4s.

MACKENZIE'S (Henry) Whole Works in 8 vols. small 8vo. cloth; published at £3. 3s., reduced to £1. 8s.

MAGEE'S (Abp.) Works, comprising Discourses and Dissertations on the Scriptural Doctrines of Atonement and Sacrifice; Sermons and Visitation Charges. With a Memoir of his Life by the Rev. A. H. Kenny, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. extra cloth, published at £1 6s., reduced to 18s. 1842.

MANT'S (Bp.) Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, &c. &c.: with Notes Explanatory, Practical, and Historical, from approved Writers of the Church of England. Fifth edition. 1 vol. 4to. bds. price £1 16s.

MANTELL'S (Dr.) New Geological Work.—The Medals of Creation, or First Lessons in Geology, and in the Study of Organic Remains; including Geological Excursions to the Isle of Sheppy, Brighton, Lewes, Tilgate Forest, Charnwood Forest, Faringdon, Swindon, Calne, Bath, Bristol, Clifton, Matlock, Crich Hill, &c. by Gideon Algernon Mantell, Esq. LL.D., F.R.S. &c. 2 thick vols. fcap. 8vo., with coloured plates, and several hundred beautiful woodcuts of fossil remains, cloth, elegantly gilt, £1 1s. 1844.

——— Wonders of Geology, or a Familiar Exposition of Geological Phenomena, new edition, illustrated by a beautiful frontispiece by John Martin, coloured plates, and upwards of 150 woodcuts. 2 vols. fcap. 8vo. extra cloth, 16s.

——— Fossils of the South Downs, or illustrations of the Geology of Sussex. Royal 4to. 42 plates, cloth, bds., published at £3 3s., reduced to £2 2s. 1822.

MARLBOROUGH'S (Duke of) Letters and Dispatches, edited by the Right Hon. Sir George Murray, 5 vols. 8vo. handsomely bound in scarlet morocco, cloth gilt, published at £5. reduced to £3 15s.

MARLBOROUGH'S (Duchess of) Memoirs of, and of the Court of Queen Anne, compiled from Original and Unpublished Documents, by Mrs. A. T. Thompson. 2 vols. 8vo. fac-simile Letters, extra cloth, bds., published at £1 8s., reduced to 10s. 6d. 1839.

MARTIN'S Eastern India. The History, Antiquities, Topography, and Statistics of Eastern India; comprising Districts of Behar, Shahabad, Bhagulpoor, Goruckpoor, Dinajepoor, Puraniya, Rungpoor, and Assam, in relation to their History, Geology, Mineralogy, Botany, Agriculture, Commerce, Manufactures, Population, Statistics, &c. Surveyed under the Orders of the Supreme Government, by Dr. Buchanan and others. Collated from the Original Documents at the East India House, under the sanction of the Honourable Court of Directors, by Robert Montgomery Martin, author of the "Statistics of the British Colonies." 3 vols. 8vo., with numerous plates, in extra cloth, bds., published at £3 12s., reduced to £1 5s. 1838.

MARTIN'S Civil Costume of England, from the Conquest to the present period, from Tapestry, MSS. &c. Royal 4to. 61 plates, beautifully illuminated in gold and colours, richly bound in cloth, with the Arms of Prince Albert gilt on the sides, £2 12s. 6d. 1842.

MILLS'S (James) History of British India. 6 vols. 8vo. calf extra. Third edition. £4 14s. 6d.

MONTAGU'S (Lady Mary Wortley) Letters, now first published complete, with the blanks filled up; to which are added her Miscellaneous Works; an Account of the Court of George I.; State of Party at the Accession: Essays, Poems, &c. published from the original MSS., with a Biographical Memoir, Introductory Anecdotes, and an Index, by her Great Grandson, Lord Wharncliffe. 3 vols. 8vo. handsomely printed, with fine portraits, gilt cloth, published at £2 2s., reduced to £1 1s. 1837.

MOSES' Antique Vases, Candelabra, Lamps, Tripods, Pateræ, Tazzas, Tombs, Mausoleums, Sepulchral Chambers, Cinerary Urns, Sarcophagi, Cippi; and other Ornaments, 170 plates, several of which are coloured; with historical and descriptive letter-press, by Hope. Small 4to. cloth, published at £3 3s., reduced to £1 5s. 1814

MURRAY'S (John Fisher) Picturesque Tour of the Thames in its Western Course, including particular descriptions of Richmond, Windsor, and Hampton Court; illustrated with upwards of 100 highly-finished wood engravings. 1 vol. 8vo. cloth, published at 17s., reduced to 10s. 6d.

NICHOLSON'S Architecture, Principles and Practice of. 3 vols. 8vo. fourth edition, 218 plates, by Lowry, cloth boards, published at £3 3s., reduced to £1 16s. 1841.

NIEBUHR'S History of Rome, epitomized, with Chronological Tables and an Appendix, by Travers Twiss, B.C.L. 2 vols. 8vo. extra cloth, published at £1 1s., reduced to 12s. *Oxon, Talboys.* 1837.

NORTHCOTE'S Artist's Book of Fables, comprising a Series of Original Fables, Illustrated by 280 exquisitely beautiful engravings on wood by Harvey and other eminent Artists, after Designs by the late James Northcote, R.A., post 8vo. portrait; elegantly bound in red turkey cloth, full gilt, published at £1 1s., reduced to 9s. 1845.

NICOLAS'S (Sir Harris) History of the Orders of Knighthood of the British Empire; with an Account of the Medals, Crosses, and Clasps which have been conferred for Naval and Military Services: together with a History of the Order of the Guelphs of Hanover. 4 vols. impl. 4to., splendidly printed and illustrated by numerous fine wood-cuts of Badges, Crosses, Collars, Stars, Medals, Ribbands, Clasps, &c., and many large plates, illuminated in gold and colours, including full-length Portraits of Queen Victoria, Prince Albert, the King of Hanover, and the Dukes of Cambridge and Sussex, strongly boarded in cloth, with morocco backs, published at £14 14s., reduced to £7 7s. 1842.

——— the same, with the plates richly coloured but not illuminated, and without the extra portraits, extra cloth, £4 14s. 6d. 1842.

NUTTALL'S Classical and Archæological Dictionary of the Manners, Customs, Laws, Institutions, Architecture, Arts, etc. of the celebrated Nations of Antiquity, and particularly of the Middle Ages; to which is prefixed a Synoptical and Chronological view of Ancient History. 8vo. extra cloth boards, published at 16s., reduced to 5s. 1840.

PALEY'S Works complete. 1 vol. 8vo. cloth, reduced to 4s.

PARDOE'S (Miss) City of the Magyar, or Hungary and her Institutions in 1839-40. 3 vols. 8vo. with nine engravings, extra gilt cloth, published at £1 11s. 6d., reduced to 10s. 6d. 1840.

PEARSON'S Exposition of the Creed, a new edition, carefully revised by Nichols, thick 8vo. new in cloth, 10s. 1845.

PINELLI'S and COOKE'S Views in Rome. Royal 8vo. containing 27 pretty plates, gilt cloth, published at 10s. 6d., reduced to 4s. 1834

POLYBIUS. The General History of Polybius, translated from the Greek. By Mr. Hampton. 2 vols. 8vo. calf, £1 1s. *Oxford*, 1823.

POPE'S (Alex.) Works, with Notes and Illustrations, and Life, by Roscoe. New edition, 8 vols. 8vo. calf extra, £4 10s. 1847.

PORTEUS'S (Bp.) Works, with his Life, by the Rev. Robert Hodgson. A new edition, in 6 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £2 8s., reduced to £1.

PUGIN'S Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornament and Costume, setting forth the Origin, History, and Signification of the various Emblems, Devices, and Symbolical Colours peculiar to Christian Design of the Middle Ages, with especial reference to the Decoration of the Sacred Vestments and Altar Furniture formerly used in the English Church, illustrated by nearly eighty plates, splendidly printed in gold and colours by the new Lithochromotographic process, containing Examples of the Ecclesiastical Costume of the Roman, English, French, and German Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; Altar Furniture; Embroidery; Diaperings; Bordures; Powderings; Floriated Crosses; Holy Emblems; Holy Monograms; Examples of the Nimbus; Conventional Forms of Animals and Flowers for Heraldic and Church Decoration; Funeral Palls, &c. &c.; also a variety of Ornamental Alphabets of Church Text of various dates. The details of many of the Ornaments are given of the full size; the whole drawn, coloured, adapted, and described from Ancient Authorities, by A. W. Pugin, Architect, Professor of Ecclesiastical Antiquities at S. Mary's College, Oscott. One magnificent vol. royal 4to. half morocco extra, top edges gilt, the back and sides ornamented with appropriate devices in gold, £7 7s. 1844

PUGIN'S Ornamental Timber Gables, selected from Ancient Examples in England and Normandy. Royal 4to. 30 plates, cloth, £1 1s. 1839.

PUGIN'S Examples of Gothic Architecture, selected from Ancient Edifices in England, consisting of Plans, Elevations, Sections, and Parts at large; with Historical and Descriptive Letter-press, illustrated by 225 Engravings by Le Keux. 3 vols. 4to. cloth, published £12 12s., reduced to £7 17s. 6d. 1838.

PUGIN'S Gothic Ornaments, 90 fine Plates, drawn on Stone by J. D. Harding and others. Royal 4to. half morocco, £3 3s. 1844.

RAIKES'S City of the Czar, being a Visit to St Petersburgh in 1828 and 1829. 8vo. gilt cloth, published at 12s., reduced to 4s. 1838.

RADCLIFFE'S Noble Science of Fox-Hunting, for the Use of the Rising Generation of Sportsmen. Royal 8vo., nearly forty beautiful woodcuts of Hunting, Hounds, etc.; extra cloth, elegantly gilt, published at £1 8s., reduced to 12s. 1839.

RAFFLES' History of Java, and Life; with an Account of Bencoolen, and Details of the Commerce and Resources of the Indian Archipelago; edited by Lady Raffles. Together 4 vols. 8vo.; and a splendid Quarto Atlas, containing upwards of 100 plates by Daniel, many finely coloured; extra Turkey cloth, published at £4 14s., reduced to £2 8s. 1830-35.

——— Memoir of the Life and Public Services of Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, particularly in the Government of Java, 1811-16, and of Bencoolen and its Dependencies, 1817-24; with Details of the Commerce and Resources of the Eastern Archipelago, and Selections from his Correspondence, by Lady Raffles. 4to. portraits, maps, and plates, extra cloth boards, published at £2 12s. 6d., reduced to £1 5s. 1830.

REE'S (Dr.) Cyclopædia, a complete set, 39 vols., and plates 6 vols.; in all, 45 vols. 4to., handsomely half-bound in morocco, cloth sides, marbled edges, price £27 10s. published in bds. at £85. 1819

ROBINSON CRUSOE, including his further Adventures, with Life of Defoe, &c. upwards of 60 fine woodcuts, from designs by Harvey and Whimper, fcap. 8vo., new and much improved edition. Just published, with additional cuts, cloth, emblematically gilt, published at 8s., reduced to 6s.

The only small edition which is complete. 1844.

ROLLIN'S (M.) Ancient History. 6 vols. 8vo., calf extra, £1 1s. 6d.

ROSS'S (Sir John) Memoirs and Correspondence of Admiral Lord de Saumarez. 2 vols. 8vo., portraits, gilt cloth, published at £1 8s., reduced to 7s. 1838.

ROSCOE'S Life and Pontificate of Leo the Tenth, new and much improved edition, edited by his Son, Thomas Roscoe, complete in two stout vols. 8vo., closely but very handsomely printed, illustrated by three fine portraits, and numerous illustrative engravings as head and tail pieces, extra cloth, £1 4s. 1845.

ROSCOE'S Life of Lorenzi de Medici, called "The Magnificent," new and much improved edition, edited by his Son, Thomas Roscoe, complete in 1 stout vol. 8vo., closely but very handsomely printed, illustrated by numerous engravings introduced as head and tail pieces, extra cloth, 12s. 1845.

——— Illustrations, Historical and Critical, of the Life of Lorenzo de Medici, with an Appendix of Original Documents. 8vo., portrait of Lorenzo and plates, boards, published at 14s., reduced to 7s.

——— the same, 4to. (printed to match the original edition) portrait and plates, boards, published at £1 11s. 6d., reduced to 10s.

*** This volume is supplementary to all editions of the work.

ROTTECK (C. V.) General History of the World, from the Earliest Times until the Year 1840. From the German, of Charles Von Rotteck, LL.D. 4 vols. 8vo. sheep gilt, £1 4s. *London*, 1842.

RUSSELL'S (Wm.) History of Modern Europe, from the Rise of the Modern Kingdoms to the Peace of Paris in 1763, in a Series of Letters from a Nobleman to his Son; with a Continuation to the Death of Alexander of Russia in 1825, by William Jones, M.A. In 10 vols. fcap. 8vo. calf extra, £3 11s. 6d.

SCOTT (Sir Walter). The Waverley Novels, Best Edition, with frontispieces and vignettes, &c., fine new copy, handsomely half-bound in morocco, marble leaves, £17. *Edinburgh*, 1829.

SCOTT'S (Rev. Thos.) Commentary on the Holy Bible, genuine trade edition, with the Author's last Corrections and Improvements, and numerous beautiful woodcut illustrations, and maps, the complete work in 3 vols. impl. 8vo. extra cloth lettered, published at £4 4s., reduced to £2 12s. 6d.

SELBY'S Illustrations of British Ornithology. 2 vols. 8vo. Second Edition, in bds., published at £1 1s., reduced to 12s. 1833.

——— the same, half-bd. green morocco, gilt edges, to match the folio volumes of plates, £1 1s.

SHAFTESBURY'S (Earl) Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions and Times. Fifth edition, in 3 vols. 8vo. calf, 21s.

SHAKESPERE.—C. Knight's Library Edition, 12 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £6, reduced to £3 13s. 6d.

——— by Chalmers. 8 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £3 12s. reduced to £2 5s.

SISMONDI'S (J. C. L.) Historical View of the Literature of the South of Europe, translated from the Original; with Notes, by Thomas Roscoe. 4 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £2 2s., reduced to £1 6s.

STORER'S Graphic and Historical Description of the Cathedrals of Great Britain. 4 vols. 8vo. half-bound morocco, published at £2 12s. 6d., reduced to £2 6s.

TATTERSALL'S Pictorial Gallery of Race-Horses, containing portraits of all the Winning Horses of the Derby, Oaks and St. Leger Stakes during the last Thirteen Years; and a History of the principal Operations of the Turf, illustrated by Portraits of some of its most distinguished Members. By Wildrake (George Tattersall, Esq.), one large handsome royal 8vo. containing 75 beautiful illustrations, chiefly steel engravings of Horses, after Pictures by Cooper, Herring, Hancock, Alken, &c. engraved by Scott, Cook, and other eminent Artists; also full-length characteristic portraits of celebrated living Sportsmen ("Cracks of the Day") by Seymour: scarlet cloth, elegantly gilt on back and sides with appropriate devices, published at £2 2s. reduced to 18s. 1844

TAYLOR, (Wm. of Norwich,) Memoir of, compiled and edited by J. W. Robberds, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, 30s.

THORESBY'S (Ralph) Diary and Correspondence, now first published from the original Manuscript, by the Rev. Joseph Hunter. 2 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £1 8s., reduced to 15s.

TILLOTSON'S (Archbp.) Works, with Life, by Birch. 10 vols. 8vo. cloth, published at £5 5s., reduced to £2 8s.

TUCKER'S Light of Nature Pursued, with some account of the Life of the Author, by Sir H. P. St. John Mildmay, Bart. M.P., complete in 2 vols. 8vo. extra cloth bds., published at £1 10s., reduced to 15s. 1842.

WADDINGTON'S (Dean of Durham) History of the Church, from the Earliest Ages to the Reformation (published by the Society for the Promotion of Useful Knowledge), complete in one closely-printed vol. 8vo. cloth lettered, published at 14s., reduced to 10s. 1833.

——— History of the Church and Reformation, enlarged edition, together in 6 vols. 8vo. uniform in cloth lettered, published at £3 1s. 6d., reduced to £1 19s. Or separately as follows:—

——— History of the Church from the Earliest Ages to the Reformation, enlarged edition, 3 vols. 8vo. cloth boards. published at £1 10s., reduced to £1 1s. 1835.

——— History of the Church during the Reformation, 3 vols. 8vo. cloth boards, published at £1 11s. 6d., reduced to 18s. 1841.

WADE'S British History, Chronologically Arranged, comprehending a classified Analysis of Events and Occurrences in Church and State, and of the Constitutional, Political, Commercial, Intellectual, and Social Progress of the United Kingdoms, from the First Invasion by the Romans to the Accession of Queen Victoria, with very copious Index and Supplement, second edition, 1 large and remarkably thick vol, royal 8vo. (1200 pages) extra cloth bds., published at £1 10s., reduced to 18s. 1844.

WALKER'S Analysis of Beauty in Woman; preceded by a Critical View of the general Hypotheses respecting Beauty, by Leonardo da Vinci, Mengs, Wickelmann, Hume, Hogarth, Burke, Knight, Alison, and others: new edition, royal 8vo., illustrated by 22 beautiful plates, after drawings from Life by H. Howard, by Gauci and Lane; elegantly bound in gilt cloth, published at £2 2s., reduced to £1 1s. 1846.

WESTWOOD'S Entomologist's Text-book, an Introduction to the Natural History, Structure, Physiology, and Classification of Insects, including the Crustacea and Arachnida, foolscap 8vo. several hundred wood-cuts, and plates; elegantly bound in gilt cloth, published at 6s. 6d., reduced to 4s. 1838.

——— the same, with the plates coloured, gilt cloth, published at 8s. 6d., reduced to 5s.

WHITE'S (Gilbert) Natural History of Selborne, with Observations on various parts of Nature; and the Naturalist's Calendar. New Edition, with Additions, by Sir W. Jardine; 18mo. many pretty woodcuts of Birds by Branston, extra cloth bds., pub. at 8s. 6d., red. to 2s. 6d.—in calf gilt, 5s. 6d. 1836

——— the same, with the plates beautifully coloured; 18mo. cloth, published at 7s., reduced to 5s.

"An excellent edition of the most fascinating piece of rural writing, and sound English philosophy, that ever issued from the press."—*Athenæum.*

WILLIAMS'S Views in Greece; 64 beautiful line engravings by Miller, Horsburg, and others; 2 vols. imperial 8vo. half-bd. morocco extra, gilt edges, published at £6 6s., reduced to £2 12s. 6d. 1829.

——— or 2 vols. in 1; whole morocco, super extra, gilt edges, reduced to £2 16s.

——— India Proofs; 2 vols. royal 4to. in 12 parts, published at £12 12s., reduced to £5 5s.

——— the same; 2 vols. royal 4to. elegantly half-bd. mor. gilt edges, published at £12 12s., reduced to £5 15s. 6d.

——— the same, 2 vols. in 1; royal 4to. whole mor. richly gilt, reduced to £6 6d.

WILBERFORCE'S Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes in this Country, contrasted with real Christianity. With a comprehensive Memoir of the Author, by the Rev. T. Price. 18mo.; printed in a large handsome type, gilt cloth, published at 6s., reduced to 2s. 6d. 1845.

——— Life, edited by his Sons. 5 vols. small 8vo. cloth, published at £2 5s., reduced to £1.

The Englishmen's Library;

A SERIES OF BOOKS FOR POPULAR READING.

The following are the Subjects and Authors, with the price in cloth boards; or, if taken as a set, £5 13.—

1. Clement Walton. (Rev. W. Gresley). 3s. 6d.
2. Scripture History: Old Test. (Dr. Howard.) 3s.
3. Bp. Patrick's Parable of the Pilgrim. (Edited by Chamberlain.) 2s. 6d.
4. A Help to Knowledge. (Rev. T. Chamberlain.) 2s.
5. Ecclesiastical History. (Rev. W. Palmer.) 4s. 6d.
6. The Practice of Divine Love. (Bishop Ken.) 2s.
7. The Lord's Prayer. (Rev. R. Anderson.) 2s.
8. The Early English Church. (Rev. E. Churton.) 4s. 6d.
9. Tales of the Village. Vol. I. (Rev. F. E. Paget.) 3s.
10. Christian Morals. (Rev. W. Sewell.) 5s.
11. Sherlock on Public Worship. (Edited by Melvill.) 3s.
12. The Five Empires. (Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce.) 3s. 6d.
13. The Siege of Lichfield. (Rev. W. Gresley.) 4s.
14. Scripture History: New Test. (Dr. Howard.) 3s.
15. Charles Lever. (Rev. W. Gresley.) 3s. 6d.
16. Tales of the Village. Vol. II. (Rev. F. E. Paget.) 3s. 6d.
17. The Art of Contentment. (Edited by Pridden.) 3s.
18. Tales of the Village. Vol. III. (Rev. F. E. Paget.) 3s. 6d.
19. The Forest of Arden. (Rev. W. Gresley. 4s.
20. Rutilius; or Stories of the Third Age. (Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce.) 4s.
21. Lives of Eminent English Laymen. (Rev. W. H. Teale.) 4s. 6d., or in three separate parts for Lending Libraries, 5s. 6d.
22. Selected Letters. (Edited by Rev. T. Chamberlain.) 4s.
23. Church Clavering; or the Schoolmaster. (Rev. W. Gresley.) 4s.
24. A Visit to the East. (Rev. H. Formby.) 7s.
25. Australia; its History and Present Condition. (Rev. W. Pridden, M.A.) 5s.
26. The American Church. (Bishop of Oxford.) 6s.
27. Monks and Monasteries. (Rev. Samuel Fox.) 5s.
28. The Martyr of Carthage. (Rev. E. Wilson.) 4s. 6d.
29. A History of the Irish Church. (Rev. W. G. Todd.) 4s. 6d.
30. Coniston Hall, or the Jacobites. (Rev. W. Gresley.) 4s. 6d.
31. Lives of English Divines. (Rev. W. H. Teale.) 5s.
32. Frank's First Trip. (By Gresley.) New edition. 4s. 6d.

All the Oxford and Cambridge editions of Bibles and Common Prayer Books, in every style of Binding, including velvet, morocco, vellum, illuminated, relieved oak, calf, and roan; the cheap editions in plain bindings, (suitable for schools, &c.)

—o—

A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF BOUND BOOKS, ADAPTED FOR PRESENTS.

—o—

Clergymen and others purchasing in quantities, and paying Cash, will be entitled to a considerable reduction.

EVERY DESCRIPTION OF PLAIN STATIONERY.

Parties desirous of disposing of their Libraries, or selections therefrom, or of exchanging large or small parcels of Books, will be met on liberal terms.

POPE'S (Alex.) Poetical Works, portrait and plates, proofs before the letters, by Fittler, Heath, &c. 6 vols.

—— LARGEST PAPER, blue morocco extra, gilt leaves, Du Roveray, Imperial 8vo. 1804

PUCKLE (James) The Club, in a Dialogue, portrait and many wood-cuts, a splendid copy, proof impressions, fawn-colored morocco extra, by Lewis. Royal 8vo. £2 2s. 1817

BURKE (John) A Genealogical and Heraldic History of the Commoners of Great Britain and Ireland. 4 vols. royal 8vo. cloth, reduced to £1 11s. 6d. 1836

SWIFT'S (Dr. Jonathan) Works, arranged by Sheridan, with Notes by Nichols. Portrait. 19 vols. large paper, calf extra, marbled edges 1801

Magazines, Reviews and all New Publications

REGULARLY SUPPLIED.

NEWS AGENT FOR TOWN, COUNTRY, AND ALL FOREIGN PARTS.

W. Davy & Son, Printers, 8, Gilbert-street, Oxford-street.

C. of E.
Book of C.P.
Lit 1900K
B439
C2

Lit 1900K
B439
C2